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Preface: A sociographic perspective: “Some Ways of being Māori”

Ka kohi te toi, ka whai te maramatanga.
If knowledge is gathered, enlightenment will follow.
(Cited by T. Moeke-Pickering, 1996.)

“Far from being members of a homogeneous group, Māori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities. The relevance of traditional values is not the same for all Māori, nor can it be assumed that all Māori will wish to define their ethnic identity according to classical constructs. At the same time, they will describe themselves as Māori and will reject any notion that they are ‘less Māori’ than those who conform to a conventional image” (Durie, 1995: 465).

Abstract

This study attempts to mine relevant material on differences between Māori and non-Māori, and differences within Māori (and to some extent within non-Māori), from “official social book-keeping sources” and surveys. In particular, I endeavour to establish the extent to which non-Māori, sole/mixed Māori and ethnic/descent Māori differ in terms of social background characteristics and their reported behaviour and attitudes. One part of the study focuses on variability in people’s Māoriness, on identity, and the range of activities and occasions in which people may (or may not) feel Māori. This includes the extent to which (essentially) non-Māori choose to support or even to participate in Māori activities.

Appendices

A few summary tables are included in the text, but most of the tables referred to in this report are provided in a separate set of appendices.
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1. Introduction: the approach

1.1 Objectives

This study aims to contribute to the understanding of the nature of disparities between Māori and non-Māori, and among Māori in major urban areas specifically within Auckland, and to suggest the formulation of evidence-based policies to assist Māori to overcome those disparities they individually or collectively find undesirable.

In order to study urban Māori disparities, several questions must be separately and jointly addressed:

- What are the historical, demographic and settlement contexts of Māori?
- What are the goals/values/aspirations of Māori?
- What have been Māori achievements/underachievements?
- How do Māori distribute their attention among different domains?
- In each of several life-domains, how well have Māori managed?
- What are the collectivities through which Māori live their lives?
- What government (and other) services/interventions affect Māori, and how are Māori affected?
- What policy implications flow from the needs of Māori and the attempted interventions to meet these needs?

For each of these questions this report is concerned with comparing:

- the differences between Māori and non-Māori;
- the range within Māoridom;
- and especially –
  - the differences between urban Māori and non-urban Māori;
  - the differences between Auckland-domiciled Māori and those in other urban areas; and
  - the differences among Māori domiciled in different areas of Auckland.

Whereas the ethnographic component of the overall study (see Volume 3) focuses on particular study sites within Auckland, this report tends more to cover Auckland Māori more generally; indeed the main focus is on urban Māori of Māori nationwide. This need to shift up and down in terms of geographical scale is imposed because of limitations in the data provided, including small sample sizes in some cases. However, this wider range of scale is also useful since it allows attention to the generalisation of the findings. It also allows the original goal of the overall study to cover all urban Māori to be met in some part.

This report takes the character mainly of a stocktaking exercise. A plethora of published studies and data-sources are reviewed in order to assemble the current “state of the art” in terms of both knowledge and information. In itself this should be useful as an assembled source compilation for policy-makers and researchers. On top of this stocktaking some more specific exercises are undertaken which link theoretical models and data in areas of importance. But the framework and appropriate data are
only linked in some areas as yet. It is too early for argumentation and evidence to be brought closely together across the full range of issues I attempt to review here.

This study is guided by a very broad conceptual framework. People are seen as having various attributes (e.g. socio-biological, social-class related etc), and to a varying extent these categories are represented in groupings, and both of these shape the patterns of people’s values/goals/attitudes and their behaviour and practices. In turn, the behaviours/practices and values/attitudes link back to affect people’s attributes. How this system works changes over time and operates differently across different institutional areas or life-domains areas, and different spatial areas and historical periods. In this study, I focus on Māori ethnicity as a significant attribute of people, and to some extent, of groupings and institutions.

1.2 The Urban Māori Disparities Programme

The overall research is focused especially on the Greater Auckland area, and includes case studies of “immigrant” Māori households located in contrasting areas of South and West Auckland (as characterized by the New Zealand Deprivation Index 1996), and others whose members are linked to tangata whenua of Central Auckland (Ngāti Whātua ki Ōrākei). The South Auckland case studies include a subset of the Waikato tangata whenua group based at Pukaki. The ethnographic fieldwork component comprises interview and observational data on the following broad topics from members of approximately 90 households. This quantitative/sociographical study extends the qualitative data into a further comparative context.

The more immediate context for this study and for other research (and policy) on Māori issues has been set by the “Closing the Gaps” programme, developed in the late 1990s by Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK: see 1998a, 2000a) at the initiative of the then Government, although subsequently modified to become a more diffuse “Social Equities” framework (this of course has long been a theme in New Zealand social policy, with closing gaps in the Health arena being prominent since at least 1993: see Rochford 2001). In this approach trends in Māori /non-Māori averages have been compared using objective data across a broad array of arenas – and without much attempt at overall summation, except for some particular attention to income and employment. Differences are interpreted in very broad cultural terms (although the Western value-set is taken as the norm).

Reaction to this “closing the gaps” approach (e.g. Chapple 2000a; Gould 2000) has extended the approach by suggesting (inter alia) that:

- there are often difficulties with the data (especially that based on official social book-keeping statistics);
- while absolute differences continue in many arenas relative differences are reducing;
- dispersions are as important as averages (and that the very overlap of Māori /non-Māori dampens the differences);
- Māori (and perhaps non-Māori) include a range of ethnic orientations;
• factors other than race (partially) explain Māori /non-Māori differences, e.g. education, social class, cultural/social capital etc (and consequently multivariate data analyses are required to capture these effects);
• there may be pockets where differences are concentrated (e.g. rural locations); and
• “culturally appropriate” programme delivery is seldom appropriate.

In more detail, Chapple asserts that (in quick summary: I have placed the immediate rebuttal of these points in brackets following):

• post 1970 Māori are better off (but a partial recent recovery follows more recently difficult times for many Māori);
• being Māori is a recent (post-1945) invention (but in fact there has been a long history of pan-tribal involvements);
• Māori is a declining construct (but this is based on misleading 1996 Census results);
• through intermarriage, the “Māoriness” of the New Zealand population is declining, although – on the other hand – because of this intermarriage, the possibility for more Māori is increased: intermarriage leads to a more widespread “browning” of the New Zealand population (so the phenomenon is complex);
• since a high proportion of Māori vote on the general roll, there is low participation in Māori politics (but Labour encouraged enrolment on the general roll and the focus of Māori effort has varied over time);
• the more successful Māori tend to choose to emphasise their Pākehā connections (but there is as much evidence to the contrary);
• the Māori ethnic revival is driven by “ethnic entrepreneurs” (who presumably enjoy benefits of this “capture”: but they receive widespread support);
• Māori and Pākehā have different “tastes” (e.g. for leisure and producing non-market goods: but evidence for this is not readily available);
• Māori in Australia also do poorly (but Australia is also racist in relation to indigenous groups).

Along somewhat similar lines, Gould argues that:
• different measures of change are required (but, this is a complex methodological concern);
• the concept of Māori ancestry is irrelevant for policy (and also statistical) purposes (but, the evidence is more complex than this);
• socio-economic differences within the Māori population are as great as Māori/non-Māori differences (nevertheless, Māori have distinctive social features);
• “degree of Māoriness” (e.g. through intermarriage) determines socio-economic success (but the evidence is more complex than this);
• modernisation is more appropriate than cultural maintenance as a goal for Māori (a value judgment).

However, much of their argumentation in this “revisionist” approach is limited theoretically (especially as it is framed in economic terms and couched at an individual level) and is poorly based on data. As a result there has been considerable contestation of their work (e.g. Alexander 2001; Portal Consulting 2001; Rochford 2001). A plethora of criticisms has been advanced including points such as:
• Pool’s argument that absolute differences are better measures of change than ratios which may be based on unstable denominators;
• Armstrong’s concern that Chapple’s “forthcoming” papers are still coming, his documentation of data is poor, and he as a civil servant has unfair access to statistics;
• Rochford’s concern that Chapple’s data exclude the low income earners (because unemployed) and also high earners (as a “cut-off”) (Rochford, 2001: 5);
• Rochford’s alternative explanations that any convergences are more a result of increasing employment, and therefore cyclical rather than secular as claimed, and that in fact Chapple’s charts show “recovery” to the smaller gaps of early dates is yet to happen; and that similarly;
• since the education gap has been steady over time it cannot be driving any changes in disparities (Rochford 2001);
• the difficulty in drawing too strong conclusions (in the face of marked colinearity) from use of proportion of variance explained and also the causal ordering revealed by step-wise regression equations (Alexander and Williams 2001).

In sum, the reaction to the Chapple-Gould argumentation has taken one of three forms:

• criticism of particular analyses;
• criticism of the more general framework within which their argument sits;
• attempts to move the debate into wider territory.

I take the third path. Rather than further rehearse the details of this debate, I prefer to note some of the lessons which can be derived, and then move on to begin to carry out the studies which are needed to further the mobilization of high quality knowledge about the range of Māori situations.

One of the effects of the academic debate on the closing of the gaps has been to render the issues recondite. But the realities contested in this debate endure. It is useful to be reminded that Closing the Gaps “...is not an academic exercise but a discussion about real need. It is the central policy issue of our time” (Rochford 2001: 9).

The Urban Māori Disparities Programme (UMDP), of which the research reported in this volume forms a part, seeks to further extend analyses and policy development in several directions. It aims to:

• examine the extent of pertinent differentiation within Māori (and non-Māori);
• examine the extent of separateness between Māori /non-Māori in terms of their daily lives, experiences etc;
• focus in particular on the characteristics of poor Māori (and to develop explanatory models indicating the correlations involved in “explaining” Māori poverty);
• examine the features associated with involvement in Māori ethnicity (language, involvement with Māori organizations etc);
• include in the analyses a range of subjective factors (e.g. Māori goals, views, attitudes, satisfactions, stresses, expressed needs etc): e.g. to examine whether Māori in fact share similar goals among themselves and in relation to non-Māori;
• examine the factors associated with success/lack of success in Māori advancement; and
• include the collective level of Māori involvement and interaction with (Māori/non-Māori) organizations and communities (and the effects of these).

The UMDP has three main but interrelated components:

• qualitative study: this covers three localities (at household and organizational/community levels);
• quantitative study: this critiques and conducts secondary analyses of appropriate official and university survey studies;
• mapping study (of spatial disparities): of both qualitative (derived from official data: this indicates how the spatial distributions of organizations/services impact on their accessibility to Māori) and quantitative data (generated by the qualitative study: this will provide a portrait of the everyday spatial behaviour of Māori).

The three legs are linked as follows:

• quantitative study produces quicker results;
• quantitative study throws up findings for the qualitative study to explain in more depth;
• quantitative study throws up findings to be mapped;
• qualitative study produces findings which the quantitative study attempts to generalize to wider populations; and
• qualitative study produces findings to be mapped.

1.3 A “Pākehā” research perspective

There is a long history of research into Māori issues by both Māori and non-Māori stretching back to first contact. Earlier research was often in the mode of turn of the 19th century “rescue anthropology” concerned with documenting the material and non-material culture of what was seen as a dying race. This has continued in more recent decades into a solid series of social science studies, with a major ethnographic impulse propelled by the Beaglehole studies (1946). The Māori “Renaissance” from the 1970s on has generated, for many, a new indigenous context for carrying out research with Māori, often in “action research mode” and with major concerns about stigmatising and indigenous ownership. One result was an at least partial withdrawal of non-Māori into historical research. In this study I place myself in the tradition of Kawharu (1984) in his conception of “Māori sociology”. This involves complementing the more traditional intellectual and scholarly tasks of cultural reconstruction, maintenance and development, with study of how things actually work in practice.

This research perspective on Māori social life, as opposed to a Māori-centred perspective, has difficulties that earlier scholars taking this viewpoint have
commented upon. Fergusson et al. (1993a: 168), also carrying out a quantitative exercise, point out that their team:

…are fully aware that the present analysis is likely to be criticized on the grounds that it is based on an ethnocentric Pākehā model of analysis which is both invalid and culturally inappropriate…

They make two points of relevance:

…it is important to note that this analysis had the potential to produce conclusions which did not favour one perspective over another perspective. It was perfectly possible for the present analysis to produce conclusions which supported the Māori perspective by showing that ethnic differentials in offending could not be explained in socio-economic terms.

Also, the socio-economic (as also the Māori perspective) explanation is “de-stigmatising”, with their explanation implying that:

…the commonly held belief that Māori are more prone to offend is, in fact, illusory and arises from statistical misunderstandings which have led what are, in fact, socio-economic differences to be identified as ethnic differences.

Two further points: firstly, when it comes to intervention, it is possible that targeting potentially manipulable socio-economic circumstances is more effective than the more “essentialist” ethnic characteristics, and secondly, qualifying the extent of ethnic difference is not incompatible with historical explanations of past injustices and colonial and post-colonial difficulties which provide structural reasons for the low socio-economic status of many Māori.

More particular issues can also arise in a study of this type. For example, focusing on the darker side of life can be stigmatizing, as in so much “victim sociology”, but must be done in order to call attention to issues which need tackling. Ritchie and Ritchie report their own dilemmas in dealing (in the 1960s) with some of the darker side of Māori life.

Comparisons fly in the face of the New Zealand ideal of a classless, raceless society where “we are all one people”, some of whom just happen to be male or female, white or brown, rich or poor … the language of comparison sounded to some like the language of criticism (1997: 43).

They then update their comments:

Currently the climate of political correctness makes it difficult to report fairly and evenly on such matters as comparative rates of child abuse, cultural practices that endorse physical chastisement and autocratic male status roles particularly in Polynesian cultures. Our duty is to our data, and to what we see as the best interests of children (1997: 43).
These comments are endorsed, and the lessons they embody have been incorporated into this study. But there is a further point that must be considered. At the heart of this study is the question of to what extent and how Māori cultural development concerns should be addressed. Very many of Māori descent have assimilated, and it is important to ensure that their voices are also heard. Again, this issue is raised by others: but it is interesting that having raised the concern, there seems to be a somewhat rapid withdrawal to a “Māori-centred” approach. This retreat is avoided in this study.

Kaupapa Māori methodology does seem very much appropriate to research work in Māori settings or with people whose participation in Māori culture is very high. Although this type of context does not prohibit comparative work or quantitative analyses, it is not entirely welcoming to such approaches. However, many Māori do not live their lives within a Māori context (and much of the life of almost all Māori is conducted in large part outside Māori contexts) and so this approach has some limitations. For a start, it is difficult to know exactly when a Māori-specific approach is particularly warranted. Further, collecting data within either Māori or non-Māori contexts may shape some of the attitudes that are expressed. It is possible that in each setting there operates a self-fulfilling prophecy with context-related attitudes heightened in either direction.

The issue, then, is not to choose one or other approach, but to include a range: triangulation. So, the research reported here complements other types: see Volume 3 of this study. Mixed methods approaches have been used before of course: one model used by the New Zealand Health Research Council has been to pair more skilled data-analysts with more appropriate data-gatherer researchers to get the best overall mix of data collection and data analysis skills.

Social research of a more quantitative type has hardly ignored ethnicities. Indeed, there is a widespread tendency in New Zealand social research for the Māori/non-Māori categorisations to be routinely deployed as standard comparisons in data-analysis. As Pool et al. wryly note, “Finally comparisons between Māori and non-Māori have been made … Indeed, in most social research in New Zealand this is the typical comparison that is made” (1999: 130). They go on to suggest wider perspectives can also be adopted: “Yet in many ways the differences between these two ethnic groups are far less important than those between New Zealand and … other low fertility countries”. For example, they suggest that there is a reasonable Māori/North American fit in terms of patterns of contraception and sterilization. However, such a comparative viewpoint is not pursued here.

Moreover, merely reporting ethnic correlations is unduly simplistic, since the comparisons are seldom entirely valid. Multivariate analyses are required to sift out some of the complexity. Another typical move in research has been to over-simplistically publish “league tables” of success (e.g. of schools in achieving good results in school examinations). As Harker and Nash (1998) point out, there is a need for “value-added analysis” since league tables do not reward the good performance of some schools of turning poorer-quality recruits into better-than-expected outcomes.
A methodological issue which then arises is how the “residual” variance is best explained: this might be understood as “luck” or “differential opportunity” or else assigned to diffuse “structural” or “cultural” factors. Any such approach must be recognised as being arbitrary.

A major issue is how ethnicity should be handled. It is assumed in line with current “best practice” that ethnicity is by self-definition. However, in the course of data collection and analysis selfdefinitions are often limited through collapsing categories. For example, the terms “Sole Māori” or “Mixed Māori” used throughout this report, are terms imposed by analysts rather than by the participants.
2. Resources for studying Māori: literature reviews/theory/methodological issues

2.1 The journal and broader literatures

To my knowledge the literature on Māori has not been subject to Bibliometric research. However, Thomas (2001) reviews a sample of 98 research reports that made comparisons between Māori and non-Māori over the 1980–96 period. He records a shift from race to ethnic categorisations over the period, but notes only 19% of the articles reported any information about the criteria for categorising ethnicity and only three mentioned how people of dual/multiple identity were categorized.

In order to get some feel for the range of literature to be drawn on and the topics it focused on, a content analysis was carried out of the journal/magazine literature on Māori issues. The source for this was Index New Zealand (INZ) and the period covered was the decade of the 1990s (see Appendix Tables 1.1). Other types of published material not covered by this source include books and reports. In order to cut through the large range of material on Māori generally, the subject term “Māori communities” was used. There are many other topics relevant to Māori on which material is published (e.g. Māori novels) but which are less central to the present study. This search yielded 250 references over the decade (strangely none from 1992). Although there were almost as many “journal” articles as newspaper articles (the INZ classification of “journal” is very broad), only some 42 were identified as being aimed at a research audience. These covered a fairly wide range of topics. Clearly there is a substantial, but perhaps not overwhelming, research literature to attend to at least as far as the journal literature is concerned.

The following discussion identifies, largely through quotations from some commentators, the most useful material from the research literature.

Cleave (1997) discusses several approaches to the study of Māori, especially those associated with University of Auckland and Victoria University of Wellington (VUW), which differ in terms of their cultural or political orientation. But what about coverage of the economic (and the social) orientation? Perhaps the University of Waikato development studies approach fits here, while Massey University studies have illuminated the social. Cleave cites Webster on a fateful point, although he does not elaborate on the implications:

… the theory of Māoritanga was developing the ideological capacity to obscure – sometimes from all concerned – the actual practice of both the exploited and those who seek to continue their exploitation (1997: 54).

Indeed, Webster (e.g. 1999) has provided a broad description and commentary on the development of Māori studies. He notes the strong empirical tradition of the immediate post-war period, but then suggests there has been a major shift:

However, since the mid-1970s there has been a striking lapse both in research and in written ethnographic description of contemporary Māori society and culture which resembles distraction or repression (1999: 27).
He then elaborates on the possible causes:

[The] Māori renaissance is one of the [causes]. As the political awareness and assertiveness of Māori culture developed in the early 1970s, the scholarly pursuit of describing and analysing Māori society was tacitly suspended in deference to what many accepted as the prerogative of the Māori themselves. Some Pākehā scholars consciously withdrew or redirected their study and publication toward subjects other than the sometimes turbulent and self-conscious society outside their doors or on the other side of town. Alternative directions took the shape of active support of these activities later to be called the Renaissance; increased attention to the Pākehā institutions which were the context of contemporary Māori culture (e.g. Māori land legislation and the Māori Land Court); and, most commonly, specialization in the past or traditional Māori culture.

Part of the explanation, according to Webster, is also intellectual drivers imported from world trends in social science thinking:

Also, in the early 1970s meanings-based theories modelled on innovations in linguistic science became predominant. … Generally, professional attention was increasingly shifted from society to culture in the presumptive sense of a whole way of life, narrowed further by the assumption that this was constituted primarily by systems of meanings. At Auckland, this shift offered theoretical rationales for preoccupation with Māori culture in the sense of tradition, ritual, symbolism, and more recently discourse understood as inscribed meaning on the hermeneutical model of texts or dialogues. … As in many colonized societies, the colonizers and even the indigenous people themselves would sometimes prefer to think of them as a thing of the past.

These trends in Māori society and in intellectual thinking have immediate impacts on scholarship:

While research in contemporary Māori society tended to be left to Māori themselves or re-centred in the past, established scholars often became hesitant actively to recruit and encourage Māori students in fields such as social anthropology, where this knowledge had previously been sought and recorded. Likewise some serious young Māori scholars inspired by anthropology nevertheless, for the sake of solidarity, committed themselves to Māori studies. On all quarters the opportunities of the Renaissance were sometimes diverted, by those with the power to do it, into the extension of careers or patronage, sometimes leaving behind those serious Māori scholars (1999: 28).

On the other hand, Webster does identify

…a few exceptions to the ethnographic silence on contemporary Māori society since the mid-1970s:
• Keith Barber on a Māori work scheme and government policy
• Jeff Sissons’ ethnographic history of the Waimana valley
• Linda Smith’s analyses of kura kaupapa and critiques of education policy
• Dun Mihaka’s critique of Māori i values and leadership in ceremonious contexts. Ranginui Walker has continued to publish brief but numerous descriptions of contemporary Māori issues … [and] has inspired a new generation of students…
• Joan Metge continues regularly to publish the most detailed descriptions available of Māori social and kin relations…
• Elizabeth Rata has begun to publish her ground-breaking ethnographic studies and critiques of the integration of “detribalized” Māori society into capitalist society.

Through the 1980s there were a limited number of research theses on Māori topics … but these continue to neglect contemporary Māori society in preference to tradition or history, and in any case few have been guided through publication (1999: 19).

I argue that the preoccupation of Māori culture as a whole way of life ideologically obscures both the present deterioration of Māori society and the colonial and recent history which has instead constituted Māori culture as a whole way of struggle. The beneficiaries of the cultural “Renaissance” may be its more opportunist patrons, Māori and Pākehā, than the majority of Māori themselves (1999: 43).

While Webster makes some useful comments about the academic research situation, he seems very university-centred and neglects the wide array of policy developments and policy-related research work, especially from government departments, and also from broader frameworks such as the Royal Commission on Social Policy.

A final point about the extant literature is that it is highly uneven, and often insufficient attention is devoted to cumulating results. For example, the Ritchies have provided well-grounded literature reviews, as have the Ministry of Education. However, in general, the literature does not seem particularly well integrated and cumulative.

2.2 A succinct review of the literature

The following review of some of the literature appropriate for this study is arranged chronologically into a partial account of successive studies on topics central to the research in this section.

Historical
There is a large literature describing many aspects of earlier periods of Māori development, but although this past still reverberates into the present, I have not made any attempt to review it here. It is important, though, to note some key periods of more recent development:
In the 1930s Māori communities tended to be rural, semi-detached and partially self-dependent;
The urban drift achieved some economic success but certainly stretched Māori social and cultural institutions close to breaking point;
It is very clear that Māori and other Polynesians took much of the brunt of the pain associated with New Zealand’s structural changes which began in the late 1980s. Some degree of recovery has only been recent.

**Comparative**
As well as casting the Māori situation within an historical context, it is important to see the ways in which the New Zealand situation compares to those overseas. This task is tackled in a wide academic literature (e.g. Smith, 1999; Fleras and Spoonley, 1999) but this is not drawn on here.

**Demography**
Perhaps because census data seems a more reliable foundation for studies than more apparently subject data-sources there is a solid phalanx of studies into Māori demography. Much of this is summarised in Pool (1991), which advances a “transition model” analysis.

Pool’s account is laced with warnings about the complex and considerably subjective nature of the apparently objective data that blurs some of the clarity which might be expected, and which must clearly be carefully traced over time (1991: 4):

Māori population history is clearly interlocked with that of Pākehā New Zealanders. There have been generations of co-residence and inter-marriage with post-1769 immigrant populations. This confounds statistical analyses and socio-cultural interpretations of demographic phenomena to such an extent, and has such profound policy implications, that any serious study of Māori population must deal with issues of ethnic identification. More importantly, it is impossible to study New Zealand demographic trends, particularly in the 19th century, without understanding the mechanisms by which Pākehā penetration of New Zealand occurred and the effects of this culture contact on Māori.

Nevertheless, Pool is able to show that in the New Zealand context, the Pākehā population followed the classic (four-stage) form of transition (Pool, 1991: 5). (However, some caveats to the Māori experience of this transition are noted in his conclusion: 242, 243). In sum, Māori population history is related to the overall historical pattern and has involved (1991: 4):

- rapid 19th century depopulation;
- gradual 20th century recuperation until c1945;
- accelerated growth until the 1960s, with radical decline in death rates;
- decreasing fertility in the 1970s; and
- increasing convergence with overall New Zealand patterns.

More generally, there are some particular features of Māori population:
Pool (1991: 7 and Passim, and other authors) has drawn attention to the c10% of total Māori population living overseas, almost entirely in Australia, whose trans-Tasman migration can affect the New Zealand situation.

“For Māori, fluctuations in the size of age-groups will be more extreme than for non-Māori, a function of both the very rapid mortality declines of the 1940s–1950s, and the accelerated fertility decreases of the 1970s”.

There is also a possibly scarred generation – aged 25–34 circa 1990 – that has been hit by the impact of high unemployment and other difficulties flowing from the claw-back of the welfare state (cf. Pool, 1991: 241).

There were also very major internal rural-to-urban migration flows in post-war period (sharpest of known populations around the world: cf. Pool, 1991: 7).

Māori women in particular are affected by early child-rearing (Pool, 1991: 13): “...the average Māori woman in her fifties will have borne five to six children and will have been pregnant at least six to eight times; for her Pākehā peer the relevant means will be 2.5–3.5 live births and three to four pregnancies”.

There have also been more locality-specific studies: for example, Yvonne Underhill-Sem (1989) studied patterns of ethnic-specific fertility differentials in four major “regions” within Auckland for the 1985–87 period. Māori fertility was lowest in the north and highest in the south across the entire range of age-groups. In the west there was higher fertility at younger ages while in the centre older ages were more fertile: evening out on average. She suggests a socio-economic explanation, with higher fertility associated with lower socio-economic conditions while the better education, training and employment opportunities in higher socio-economic areas allow Māori women there to change their fertility behaviour especially towards delayed child-bearing.

Community studies
Another long-established tradition is that of community studies. The Beagleholes studied the Ōtaki Māori community in the early 1940s. Taking a psychoanalytical approach, they

...placed great emphasis on what they termed the parental rejection of children as the critical experience in childhood that determined Māori sociability, social sensitivity and search for approval (Ritchie 1997: 20).

In turn, they argued that the adult character structure and cultural style were directly determined from such early experiences.

In the 1950s, research into Māori child-raising was extended by the Ritchies in Murupara, who later summarized their work in five “socializing principles” (1997):

- “[E]very Māori child in Murupara was born into a community of kinship membership, concern and care.”
- The Māori responses to small children were “constant, distributed, uninhibited and warm”.
- Multiple-parenting: “Adults other than biological parents had much the same rights as whānau members to do everything a parent would do for a child: feed it,
provide warmth and affection, correct, control, reprimand or otherwise discipline the child including physical chastisement. Temporary or permanent whänau adoption was extremely common and customarily arranged and sustained, the law was rarely involved”.

- “As a pragmatic response to a set of family realities and needs” there was a gradual shift to greater independence and a wider network of available care.
- Peer-socialization: “Older children were responsible for younger children within the whänau” and the young formed “play gangs” (age sets) which “progressed through school years and beyond”.

The Ritchies also report a darker side:

There were brutalized families in Murupara; there were disorganized families; there were people nobody wanted to have anything to do with. There was a lack of privacy; most high-school children reported that they wanted to leave and never to come back (1997: 24).

In rural communities:

…community events and close family involvement patented life so that individual planning was not necessary. No one needed to budget; there was always a car to be borrowed (1997: 22).

In the newer urban locations, stress was often experienced, and migration and linkages back to the rural core areas elicited. Some of the older-established urban families were able to successfully establish themselves, and have a nostalgic relationship to the Māori past.

In the subsequent Katikati and Wellington urban studies it was found that Māori mothers were less inclined to supervise closely (1997: 37), reasoning that if the kids were quiet they were up to little harm (the very conditions leading Pākehā mums to become suspicious!). The small town mums had moved there from the pā, usually on marriage or shortly after, and were under stress:

…the new environment did not support their old and known, comfortable behaviour patterns and the new surroundings were seen as judgemental and critical. (1997: 45)

In direct comparison with the Pākehā sample the Māori mothers were harsher in their discipline, showed a more rigid attitude towards “bad” behaviour and reasoned less. There was more father involvement in a casual sort of way but mostly these mums were on their own (except for the pā). … They bothered less about the development of inner conscience, whether the child owned up to demeanour, admitted fault when challenged and so on, expected more independence and cared less about how the child acted outside the home. (1997: 48)

Māori parents often expressed high aspirations for their children. They had not, however, found the recipe for that success. They still regarded the child as
having a right to his or her own world and did not intervene to set progressive standards, move the child from goal to goal or otherwise shape progress towards achievement. (1997: 49)

Of course, the resistance of Pākehā institutions formed a further severe barrier:

Māori families had frequently been forced by circumstances into living styles where their traditional and comfortable child rearing patterns came under strain. (1997: 49)

Although Māori families were often larger, there was less joint family planning of family activities. Moreover, the urban poverty of Māori households could not readily be mitigated by shared vehicles, kitchen gardens and subsistence activities.

**Māori social units**

In her more recent historical work on processes of iwi formation and deformation Ballara argues that:

> It may be that in modern, urban Māori society whānau (as kin clusters) might have superseded hapū as the most important unit were it not that land and other issues continue to make descent as well as kinship of vital importance (1998: 169).

She suggests that whānau are subject to similar processes as iwi and hapū, including name changes to mark shifts in identity over time.

Ballara provides a useful historical time-depth that provides a useful time frame for this study:

Through the period [19th and early 20th centuries] studied hapū were corporate as well as conceptual groups – groups of people who thought of themselves as a group because of their kin links through descent, but who combined in concrete ways to perform various functions for their defence, their self-management, to conduct relations with the outside world, and in many of their important economic affairs. Hapū were independent politically; they acknowledged no higher authority than that of their own chiefs.

Iwi in the 18th century were conceptual groups: that is, they were wide categories of people who thought of themselves as sharing a common identity based on descent from a remote ancestor. At that time they did not act together in corporate ways. In response to both internal and exotic influences this situation changed in the late 18th century; the word “iwi” took on, in some cases, new more restricted meaning as some iwi activated themselves as alternative, more inclusive corporate groups, these iwi or “tribes” adapted themselves to become, in the 20th century, the most recognized Māori descent groups (1998: 336).

Other writers, such as Metge, have also contributed to the structural history of Māori social life:
Early European visitors to Aotearoa New Zealand identified “the whânau” as “the basic social unit of Māori society” in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. According to their description, it was a domestic unit comprising several parent-child families related by descent and marriage, moving between several living sites and engaging in a variety of productive activities under the leadership of a kaumātua (household head) (Metge 1995: 16).

In her magisterial recent volume on whânau, Joan Metge (1995) suggests that very little is known about the extent to which Māori are involved in whânau structures. She comments that membership in whânau is a matter of choice. Metge decries the lack of adequate social science research knowledge about the functioning of Māori family situations and guesses that some one-third to one-half of Māori are involved in whânau. She suggests that this involvement is concentrated among older Māori, but also that it tends to be a growing trend.

The Massey University Te Hoe Nuku Roa (THNR) survey research project (see Fitzgerald et al. 1999 and 2000: further analyses are provided in Stevenson et al. 2002) includes some questions on whânau, which they define as “…blood relatives who do not live in the same household as the respondent” (and not referring to spousal relatives). These yielded a rather different picture, although one which is difficult to entirely interpret. Their study is also limited in that it is mainly orientated to people who identify fairly definitely as Māori. The data indicates that some 70–80% report strong linkages among whânau, that whânau plays a large part in their lives, and that they engage with some frequency in activities involving whânau (e.g. marae visits). A similar proportion of respondents report having access to a non-relative based “whânau”, for example, a work grouping. However, the information on whânau in this study is relatively thin.

In order to remedy this gap in knowledge concerning whânau it has been a focus of attention in the ethnographic component of this study (see Volume 3).

Lastly, it is more generally known from basic statistical sources that Māori tend to live in larger households than Pākehā, and that more are sole-parent households.

But, how do whânau actually operate “on the ground”? Taiapa (1994) provides a succinct picture of the economics of the whânau drawn from interviews with 20 case study families. Since the study is generally concerned with money they make the key point that for their Māori respondents

…Self-worth in giving not accumulating wealth, which isn’t associated with status: rather birth position and leadership skills.

Resource flows between whânau and households involved gifts and loans between individuals, hospitality, sharing of goods and services and contributions to whânau events and activities (1994: 37).

Moreover,
mana and status in Māori terms is not measured by occupation and income. It is measured more in terms of contribution to the community and to the mana of the community as a whole.

There seem to be several ways, according to these case studies, in which families are involved with whānau:

- giving/lending sums of money, perhaps with a general expectation of repayment (which varies);
- sharing hospitality often for long periods, again without an expectation that the guest will pay;
- joint celebration in the form of hui to celebrate special events (with time, money and services, sometimes provided through loans from lending institutions in emergencies, although also sometimes regularly saved for through regular savings and/or through trusts);
- the whole enterprise is laced through with aroha and the culturally valued importance of whānau activities.

There are some other points made in the study:

- meeting whānau obligations often takes first priority over other draws on family income;
- participation in whānau-hosted events often involved an established division of labour with roles being passed on intergenerationally;
- not all Māori participate;
- in most cases, the different whānau involvements of spouses can pull a household in different directions;
- there can be a major drain on resources and tension between spouses;
- money is not such an important resource;
- some Māori may choose to “drop out” from active hands-on financial management;
- high income households have higher obligations (including covering shortfalls from the less well-off), and in general contribution is scaled to the ability to provide;
- contributions to hui and so on belong to the whānau (and cannot be extended to private use).

Māori identity
Another strand of Māori research (also going back to the work of the Ritchies) has been on the conceptualization of Māori identity (for a broad review see Kukutai, 2001). Metge (1995) summarizes some decades of her own work, in some pithy statements:

Taken collectively, te iwi Māori is characterized by a combination of characteristics: genealogical descent from the pre-European inhabitants of New Zealand, distinctive physical features, distinctive values and ways of organising social life, shared history, and consciousness of kind (“a we feeling”). Those who identify themselves and are identified by others as Māori
do not necessarily display all these characteristics in their own person (1995: 18).

While demographers, social scientists and the general public continue to debate the definition of “a Māori”, the Māori determine the issue in their own way. They specify descent from a Māori parent or ancestor as the basic requirement, and, provided that is fulfilled, accept as Māori those who identify themselves as Māori. Attempts to impose a narrower definition in terms of linguistic or cultural competence are generally rejected (1995: 18).

A far more quantitative approach has been taken by David Thomas (1988) who reports the development and implementation of a 40-item questionnaire that assesses knowledge of Māori language and cultural practice. When administered to samples of school children and university students, the test had satisfactory item-total correlations, internal consistency and also differentiated among ethnic Māori and ethnic Pākehā. In an earlier study (1986), Thomas found that Māori children with some knowledge of Māori language and culture have higher scores on achievement tests than Māori children who have little or no knowledge of Māori culture. In a later study (Thomas and Nikora 1996), it was found that Pākehā people see ethnic differences as consisting primarily of differences in physical appearance, whereas Māori students’ conceptions of being Māori emphasized culture and language.

Very recently, Broughton et al. (2000) reviewed the conceptualization of identity and found broad support for the notion that ethnic identification is associated with higher levels of cultural involvement. But, they found little hardcore involvement in Māori culture, perhaps because the age group they studied is seduced by youth culture (2000: 28).

They claimed the implications are that:

…because of the high variation in ethnic identification and participation among those classified as Māori there is a need for a parallel variability in service provision with services for young Māori spanning a range of options that include both mainstream and Māori community based services (2000: 29).

Gibson found that how women saw themselves was rarely congruent with how they were perceived by others (cited by Kukutai, 2001: 60).

Māori position in New Zealand society
Moving out to the wider societal scale, Māori need to be fitted into the broader New Zealand social landscape. Webster asks:

Where does the situation of Māori fit into contemporary social class relations? In some ways, Māori are the most staunch or self-aware sector of the New Zealand working classes, usually quiescent or unaware since the 1950s and decimated in most industries since the ECA [Employment Contracts Act] of the early 1990s. If we put aside the 3–5% of the Māori who have broken into the middle class, the cultural difference of the Māori working class often manifests itself in council workers, road and shearing
gangs, and certain industries locally such as meat-workers and longshoremen. But this proletariat blends with the Māori under- and unemployed in the shapeless and sometimes threatening forms characteristic of a lumpen-proletariat: street kids, prostitutes, and motorcycle gangs… (1999: 44)

He points out that “[Māori] often spurn the symbols of middle class aspirations and instead defiantly appear as rural working-class, especially among the young”.

Māori health
Some quite sophisticated studies have tried to pin down the extent to which, in the broader picture, Māori /non-Māori differences might be attributable to class or other differences. These particularly cluster in the areas of health, crime, intelligence, Māori language and education.

An earlier study (Dell and Elliott 1975) found no differences in terms of health of elite children of Māori and of Pākehā ethnicity.

Several important studies have been carried out on health issues (Davis 1984a, 1984b). In one study, Davis et al. suggest that up to two-thirds of the differential might be “statistically explained” by socio-economic status. More recently, this study has been updated (Sporle et al. 2002). The updated study covers the last two decades with measures of mortality rates for 1976, 1986 and 1996 censi. “Māori male mortality was significantly higher than non-Māori mortality in each social class and for the total population for amenable, non-amenable and all causes of mortality. The social class mortality differences within Māori were markedly greater than non-Māori class differences. The persistently high Māori mortality rates, when controlled for social class, indicate that the poor state of Māori health cannot be explained solely by relative socio-economic advantage”. Of course, there may be other social differences, beyond those captured by occupation level, which affect the ethnic differential.

The Massey THNR programme team have recently reported some interesting effects of involvement with whānau and Māori things on health measures (self-rated health, visits to a GP and smoking). After controlling for both age and gender “…the larger the part whānau played in the participants’ life, the less frequently they visited a GP, the more likely they were to rate their health better, and the less likely they were to smoke” (Stevenson et al. 2002: 7). (On the other hand, the relationships may be more complex than this and intra-whānau ill-health is possible. These relationships did not hold for frequency of visits to marae.)

Māori crime
Fergusson et al. (1975) found that a substantial (but not complete) portion of the difference between Māori and non-Māori in terms of age-standardised juvenile delinquency rates is explained by socio-economic factors (see also Fifield and Donnell 1980).
More recently, Fergusson (and co-workers) have reported on several issues related to ethnicity as part of the Christchurch Health and Development Study: particularly scholastic achievement (1991) and juvenile offending (1993a, 1993b). Some 9% of their sample (surprisingly high as this is a South Island sample) are recorded as Māori, although the vast majority of these have a Pākehā parent, and many are being “...reared in home environments with both Pākehā and Māori parents” (1993a: 158). In the study of offending it was also found that initial differences in terms of ethnicity (Māori offend some 1.45 to 2.25 times more than Pākehā children) shrank to statistical insignificance once controlled for a range of background social variables, including social class. This was because:

In general, children of Māori and Pacific Island ethnicity tended to come from homes in which various disadvantageous features were more common ... low socio-economic status; below average living standards; greater family instability; more punitive and less emotionally supportive early mother/child interaction and a higher rate of disadvantage during the child’s early years (1993a: 162).

Each of these factors was, variously in terms of different offences, involved in “explaining” higher rates of offending.

Belich (2001) spends some space pointing out that many gangs are Māori, or have a high Māori -relatedness, and that it is believed (through police intelligence) that some 30,000 people are involved in this context (see also below).

Amid a surge of media accounts of Māori child abuse it is interesting that the survey carried out on this topic by Carswell (2001) reports that Māori and Pacific Islanders are far less likely to wish to physically punish their children.

Lash (1998) reported that in a census of prison inmates among female prisoners 42% were Māori, 13% Māori /European and 27% European (4% other and 3% Pacific), whereas for males the proportions are: 44%, 5%, 38%, 10%, and 2% respectively. Māori ancestry reached 60%.

In a survey of police (discussed in Bev James 2000) some 12% identified as Māori but another 6% identified having some Māori ancestry. Māori police officers tend to also hold similar views on Māori offending, but are keen for their position within the police to be accorded enhanced status and for attitudes towards themselves to improve.

Also studied were the political aspirations of the Māori police officers where a general level of support for increased organisational support for Māori was found. A useful finding was that “Increased contact with Māori in one’s private life, either through social activities or family membership, was associated with more favourable attitudes” (p. 18).

Māori intelligence and scholarly performance
Part of the continuing research program of the Christchurch Development Study has been attention to psychological variables. On several psychological measures,
including IQ, differences were reduced once socio-economic status variables were controlled. In particular, Fergusson et al. (1991) found there were no differences in terms of non-verbal intelligence tests. However, given the heavily bicultural and regionally specific characteristics of the study, it is difficult to generalize with confidence. Indeed, Fergusson et al. (1991) report from reviewing other studies that the ethnicity/IQ correlation increased northwards, which might imply that ethnic differences might have more “causal bite” in more ethnically visible circumstances.

In an earlier study Fergusson et al. (1982) suggest an alternative explanation to socio-economic determination is that variations between ethnic groups arise from culturally defined differences in child-rearing and other practices rather than socio-economic factors” (p. 171).

Even by three years it is possible to demonstrate both qualitative and quantitative differences in the mix of health, home conditions and educational opportunities encountered by children from families of differing ethnic background. As a general rule, children with two Māori or Pacific island parents fared worst and those with two Pākehā parents fared best from a material point of view; the group with one Pākehā and one Polynesian parent had results which lay between these extremes. These differences persisted, albeit in an attenuated form, when socio-economic and other relevant factors were taken into account (p. 176).

Māori class
There seem to be few studies of class processes within Māoridom: for example, on the undoubted development of a Māori middle class. Interestingly, in relation to this, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (Gem) survey (Frederick & Carswell 2001) claims a very high interest in entrepreneurship from Māori, who far outstrip other ethnic groups (2001: 23). In terms of other evidence this seems unlikely and might be accounted by a class-bias among Māori telephone respondents.

Some empirical evidence from poverty studies can also be adduced (e.g. Waldegrave et al. 1999). In this study of low-income households, many of the items covered show the Māori low-income households to be rather more deprived than Pākehā, although not so deprived as Polynesian low-income households. Māori households also had a somewhat different pattern of entertainment expenditure. In another poverty study Waldegrave and Stephens (1997) were able to show that Māori and non-Māori respondents had very similar thresholds in terms of perceived poverty incomes, although the “baskets” of items involved differed slightly.

Mary Mowbray’s (2001) painstaking study provides a definitive picture of household income trends over the last two decades. (She notes that Māori are younger and thus are more likely to have children living with them.) In her section on Households including Māori (p. 32, ff) she finds that:

The income position of households which included a Māori adult relative to other households was subject to considerable fluctuation over the period. In 1982, these households had a mean equivalent disposable income that was
89% of the overall mean. By the early 1990s, this had reduced to around 80%. The proportion grew back to 87% by 1996 but had slipped again to 83% by 1998. (p. 33)

The spread of households with Māori adults has followed much the same pattern, with a more evenly spread pattern succeeded by increased dispersion and then a partial recovery (Mowbray 2001: see also pp. 43, 66).

Salmond et al. (1998) with their Index of Deprivation show that higher proportions of Māori live in areas of high deprivation. Although the index can be faulted for changing content from census to census and remaining at an aggregate level, it is validated against life expectancy information and so provides considerable validity in measuring differential life-chances. Their Index of Deprivation work shows the ethnic gap grows from the highest through to the lowest decile areas. (More detailed information about geographical dispersal of poverty areas is found in Mare et al. 2001.)

Although the main report on the Māori component of a study of living standards of older people had yet to be released at the time of writing, some tables are available (Ministry of Social Development 2002) in which it can be ascertained that major differences are found between European and Māori elderly in terms of:

- material well-being score;
- number of items want but don’t have because of cost;
- number of items have economised on “a lot”;
- number of difficulties have paying for things;
- standard of living relative to others of the same age (12% “worse” cf. 5%);
- standard of living relative to other New Zealanders;
- satisfaction with standard of living;
- tenure;
- number of recent financial stressors;
- number of financial stressors while in their 50s; and
- assets.

Māori were also slightly disadvantaged in terms of income and particularly in terms of housing costs. The general report suggests (2001c: 44) that:

[elderly] Māori have lower living standards, and that most of this difference was explained by other variables in the analysis (income, savings, accommodation costs) correlated with both ethnicity and living standards. This suggests that the lower living standards experienced by Māori are largely a consequence of their economically disadvantaged position. However, even after other variables in the analysis have been taken into account, a part of the difference for Māori remains.

Most recently in their “Briefing to the Incoming Minister” MSD (2002b) report that:

...Provisional results from the 2000 Standard of Living Survey show that 20% of the population were living in families with low living standards. The
survey reveals that children were more likely to experience low living standards than those aged over 65 (29% of children compared to 7% of those aged over 65). Groups at high risk were sole parent families with dependent children (53%), those in receipt of income-tested benefits (57%), Māori (39%) and Pacific people (42%) (pp. 6, 7).

Sutherland and Armstrong (2001) argue that, using Income Survey data over the 1997–2000 period and controlling for productivity characteristics, there is evidence that Māori are consistently segregated into lower occupational classes than their measurable characteristics would predict and that 30–48% of the Pākehā / Māori wage differential is not accounted for by measurable productivity characteristics or occupational level. There is evidence both of underpayment of Māori within occupational classes and sorting of Māori into lower occupational classes. They also helpfully review a slew of earlier studies.

The NZ Saving Survey (SNZ and the Retirement Commissioner 2002) shows that, clearly, Māori non-partnered and also partnered are low wealth-holders, and far below the level of Pākehā and Asian. In particular, wealth variation within Māoridom is particularly high, especially for non-partnered. Age, employment status, education and marital status also have an impact, and to some extent can explain part of this differential.

In addition, the NZSS sought information on (part) ownership of assets that belong to an iwi or hapū such as land, and on the dollar value of this. This of course was not always easy for respondents to gauge. About half those with rights of access were able to provide a monetary estimate of the worth of their share. Māori assets comprised a large proportion of the net worth of those with them (perhaps some 50% overall). Of Māori respondents, some 15% of non-partnered and 18% of couples had Māori assets. Oddly enough, there is a sharp pattern of increase in access to Māori assets with increasing age. The proportion inheriting (29%) is similar to that for Pākehā.

Māori language
There have been a slew of studies examining Māori language. In the Te Puni Kōkiri (2001c) “Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language” a (phone) study of Māori (n=615) and non-Māori (n=725) respondents was undertaken in late 2000 by BRC. Major results reported are that:

- one-third of Māori can already speak conversational Māori while another one third were currently learning;
- some two-thirds agreed that “all Māori should make an effort to speak Māori...”;
- one-half claimed that “learning Māori was a very high priority”;
- over two-thirds considered there had been an increase in the number learning to speak Māori and almost all saw this as a “good thing”.

The analysis then goes on to segment the Māori respondents into several clusters: cultural developers (68%), Māori only (20%) and uninterested (12%). Half of the Pākehā group were passive supporters with most of the rest uninterested. Nevertheless
use of Māori in Māori contexts was supported by European respondents. A battery of nine attitude to language items was included in the study.

Other studies include the TPK (2001a) work on the use of Māori in the family. Using eight focus groups from different contexts, a complex analysis is built up of the factors which are needed to project the wider and more sustainable use of the Māori language. This analysis may have wider applicability.

**Māori education**

There have been a large number of studies, many of considerable methodological sophistication, in the area of Māori education. In concluding this section, I take advantage of the recent publication of a policy-orientated review of the whole area by the Ministry of Education.

Ballara (1986: 148–150) comments on some earlier studies of “Māori psychology” which indicated that achievement in Māori culture was often considered “deviant”, and that although the New Zealand schooling system provided similar conditions for all, Māori tended not to take advantage of these opportunities.

In their “Value-added methodology” study of “Progress at School” (Nash et al. 1998 Table 3.1, p. 21) shows the sharp increase in the percentage of Māori as the s.e.s. decile range changes: from 4% in the top decile down to 57% in the bottom decile. Their more detailed study of 37 schools is able to discriminate between school and individual effects, but does not provide specific information on Māori.

AGB-McNair (1992) showed over half of their New Zealand-wide Māori sample (and especially “sole Māori”) preferred bilingual and 20% immersion education.

It is useful to both summarise and also reflect on the recent attempt by Ministry of Education research staff (2001b) to pull together the lessons that might be extracted from educational research. This report is addressed quite specifically at:

- providing “research-based information on positive educational initiatives focused on Māori”; and
- “outlining ‘some action-orientated’ approaches and practices, identified from the research, that seem to be associated with improved educational outcomes for many Māori students” (2001b: 2).

These seem useful goals. However, several caveats are quickly stated (2001b: 3, and ff.):

- “The number of research studies we were able to cover for this paper is quite small. There are undoubtedly many other studies whose findings would have added considerably to this review” [they cover some 40 studies];
- “This paper has avoided a focus on ‘socio-economic factors’”;
- “Most of the research we have covered for this paper falls into the category of qualitative rather than quantitative research. Primarily, this is because the majority of research which reports positive initiatives in Māori education is qualitative in nature”. [They argue that insights can be usefully accrued as a result.]
• “In order to synthesize the important findings this paper outlines some of the most common themes emerging from the research findings. Although this can suggest an emphasis on ‘solutions for all’, this is not the intention, given the diversity among Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand”.

• “We found that some findings are very consistent [but] in other cases there are no straightforward answers … what is clear is that education for any group of people is a complex matter.”

Finally (2001b: 29), it is suggested that kaupapa Māori research might add a lot more, and in listing areas where research is limited the authors indicate that more is known about the broad-brush generalities than the detailed dynamics (e.g. of classroom situations).

They conclude “strong partnerships between schools, students, parents, whānau, and communities are vital…” (2001: 29), and in turn that:

Strong partnerships seem to be dependent upon:

**Schools and teachers**

• ensuring that students know about and/or have access to successful role models;
• ensuring that parents and whānau are well informed about what is happening at school and why;
• ensuring that parents and whānau are clear about what their role should be in relation to their children’s education;
• ensuring that parents, whānau and community members (especially those who did not have good experiences during their own education) feel welcome;
• ensuring that support for parents, whānau and community members, including the opportunity to gain new knowledge and skills, is readily available if required;

• Parents, whānau and communities, demonstrating that they believe in the value of education by: actively supporting their children’s education (e.g. by encouraging effort);
• taking part in decision-making processes at their children’s early childhood centres, schools and kura;

• Students having a say about what they want from education;
• students working collaboratively with teachers to establish and achieve appropriate goals;
• students understanding the implications of peer pressure, and

**All parties in education:**

• engaging in open discussion of difficult issues, e.g. racism, in order to reach solutions.

The sheer importance of education in setting up children for life cannot be underestimated. However, education may not be entirely appropriate as a model for
other less well-favoured institutional areas to “copy”. It is a relatively well-bounded, well-researched and well-ordered institutional area, where needed reforms might well be more readily identified and appropriate changes then made. Further difficulties with the report are that it fails to problematize the notion of “Māori”, and it does not grapple with the awkward linkages with social class, and more generally with the complexities of underlying social realities. Consequently, a major difficulty is that the findings are assembled from various piecemeal studies and so it is difficult to relate each set of findings to the varying contexts (institutional, community and so on) in which they are found. In addition, without the benefit of a complex “research design”, it is difficult to disentangle possibly intertwined factors. One obvious example is the “cultural” compared to “social” aspects of being involved with Māori concerns – are Māori (variously) more concerned to learn Māori culture and/or to participate in a “user-friendly” social context; for example, is there a “Hawthorne effect” compared to a straight cultural effect?

Undoubtedly, there is much more to be gleaned from the literature, and relevant material will be included in the more substantive portions of this report where appropriate. Above all this review does identify some very important material, which must be taken into account. Some of the pictures of, and insights into, Māori social life gained are useful in guiding this study. On the other hand, it is quite clear the large area between Māori and non-Māori social life is seldom touched on and there is a large swathe of people who do not have a clear image or a clear voice.

In sum, how far might we go on “exporting” the above set of recommendations to other institutional areas? Probably, quite a long way! Many of the points made are quite generic.

**Māori goals**

There have been several discussions of goals that Māori might hold. Professor Mason Durie notes (2001a) that important goals for Māori are likely to include good health and a high standard of living in common with the rest of society. However, he also suggests that a further goal might also be for Māori to be able to live as Māori. This could mean having access to language, culture, marae and resources such as land and tikanga.

This is detailed more formally in Ministry of Education (2001b) “A framework for considering Māori educational advancement”: the goals indicated are:

- to live as Māori;
- to actively participate as citizens of the world;
- to enjoy good health and a high standard of living.

A particularly important study was published recently by the Ministry of Social Development (Gray et al. 2002) in which the children, caregivers and relevant providers were interviewed across some 60 households covering Pākehā, Māori and Pacific subsamples. Respondents were asked to envisage goals for the (current) children at age 18 and then age 25, and finally to reflect on the barriers that might face the children in achieving those goals. Since the samples are not representative and are small, the results cannot be generalised, but are highly convincing.
Overall, very considerable similarities were found. It is instructive, nevertheless, to review the differences between the three groupings:

The similarities between the three ethnically differentiated groups were greater than the differences between them. All focused on the need for a good education for young people; all wanted their young people to obtain good jobs, to have a sense of self-worth and to have respectful and supportive relationships with others. The ability and confidence in being able to achieve those were more likely to be related to income (i.e. being able to afford the necessary things to achieve outcomes) and to the educational background of parents (i.e. having the knowledge and information about what to do) than to ethnicity.

Nevertheless, there were some differences. As noted above, Māori and Pacific participants articulated more clearly than Pākehā respondents their wish that young people have a strong sense of their cultural identity. This difference may reflect all groups’ acknowledgement of Pākehā cultural domination in New Zealand. Māori and Pacific participants were also more likely than Pākehā respondents to expect young people to have an active involvement with the extended family throughout their young adulthood. This included living with family/whānau, living nearby or having space for family members to stay and, particularly for Pacific families, taking on a greater share of family obligations, including financial obligations, as they grew older. Many of the young Māori and Pacific people interviewed perceived their family ties and responsibilities in the same way as the adults and already had a sense of reciprocity and mutual obligation. Māori and Pacific respondents were more likely than Pākehā to describe education as a key to improving social status and financial circumstances. Māori and Pacific families and young people in particular indicated that more information would be helpful to them in making decisions about the future. Pacific providers noted the importance of study support and homework centres. Among Pacific respondents, a good outcome was sometimes linked to sporting achievement rather than academic achievement.

2.3 Review of theoretical models (some ways of being Māori: models of disparities/achievements)

2.3.1 Introduction

It is important that any major study be in some major part theory-driven, while of course open to being guided by the way the empirical data turn out. Each model should identify a single (and for current purposes simple) “causal mechanism” which portrays why a particular social phenomenon is likely to arise. Theoretical models can guide the search for appropriate data, where appropriate means apposite in testing the implications of each. Theoretical models may also be useful in indicating possible policy implications: if a theoretical model proves to be empirically useful it may indicate policy levers that need to be invoked to ensure change. Above all, theoretical
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models should provide short summative ways of thinking about the subject matter, which sharpen an analyst’s thinking.

There are several caveats about the models produced here. It is by no means clear that the full range of applicable models have been identified: hopefully other candidates might emerge in reaction to this study. None is assumed to be true merely because they are listed here; any and all require empirical verification. Baldly stated, some may be morally offensive, but this is not intended since, if nothing else, empirical refutation of repugnant views might be useful. Another caveat is that it is almost entirely likely that a range of several models would need to be pressed into service to explain some phenomena: it is unlikely that social explanations are ever mono-causal. Further questions arise, if it seems apposite to suggest that several models are in operation, about how exactly each might combine to provide the joint causation: for example, the processes suggested by models might be additive or multiplicative. A final caveat is that the causation implied at the centre of each model is not necessarily assumed to operate uniformly at all times and overall in all places, but may rather be invoked differentially in relation to particular contexts or particular subpopulations.

Where do different models come from? In the end, positing models is (as Popper suggested) a creative activity. However, many can be derived from the existing literature on social inequalities. In fact, the burden of proof of many of the models suggested here rests on their success in a myriad of studies as summarized in the research literature on Māori. However, although this literature has been selectively reviewed above, it is not explicitly drawn on in this section.

This study does not examine the prevalence of particular models in the literature on Māori. For example, “regulation theory” has been drawn on in several instances. This is a task that might usefully extend from this current exercise.

2.3.2 Equity in life chances: the dependent variable

What is this study trying to explain? It is important to be very clear about what the key dependent variable is. (In addition, we should take heed of Robert K. Merton’s advice that the phenomenon to be explained must be “established” empirically, before launching into major explanatory exercises, lest we tilt at windmills.)

The concern of this study can be presented in a variety of quite colloquial ways: do Māori (as opposed to non-Māori) get a good deal, or as good a deal in New Zealand? Are any disparities “socially just”? One, more technical, vocabulary is to talk in terms of “life-chances”, especially objective life-chances, such as life expectancy. Is the (objective and/or subjective) quality of life of Māori worse than that of non-Māori?

It may be useful to define the two key terms here: equity involves seeking to attain equal outcomes according to equal need (and thus equality of access to services and processes of empowerment). Equality is the tougher criterion of exactly equal treatment.

There are two main general models of quality of life that are pertinent: we can contrast models which posit equality of outcome from those suggesting we should aim
at equality of process. The former is a tougher stance demanding that everyone (irrespective of personal qualities or talents) should achieve the same level of success. The latter holds rather that existing conditions should not get worse, or even that poorer initial conditions should be compensated for. This places the emphasis on the fairness of the process. However, the trade-off for this more limiting stance is that it tends to underemphasize the (possible) need for structural reform – in order to “level the playing field”.

A major issue in assessing the quality of life is whether the same goals (or goalposts to continue the “game” metaphor) should be assumed for each grouping within a society. Are Māori goals similar to those of non-Māori? This is a matter needing empirical investigation, as well as requiring considerable theoretical reflection. (This empirical question will be tackled in another section.) In the meantime it will be assumed that Māori and non-Māori have similar levels of aspiration, at least in terms of economic/material matters.

A final point is the extent to which these models are Māori-specific. This author’s general position is that although these models particularly target a Māori situation, in fact, it would be possible to substitute the name of any other “minority group” and achieve the same sort of explanatory power, while missing many nuances.

2.3.3 Some models

In this section a series of models is each separately canvassed. The models are presented in a particular order that will be discussed after they have been listed. In the following section, the argument involved with each will be spelled out in more detail.

- The Age Difference model: The age structure (and other differences between Māori and non-Māori) places extra impediments on Māori levels of achievement.
- The Class model: much of the lack of achievement of many Māori is also shared by the New Zealand working class generally.
- The “Recent Migrant” model: Māori have only been in cities a couple of generations, but will catch up with the mainstream in time.
- The Capitalist/Structural model: Māori have insufficient access to the main structural levers of collective achievement (e.g. economic capital) and more generally the intergenerational mobility processes of Māori don’t work as well.
- The Discrimination model: Māori are seriously discriminated against by non-Māori who retain control over gatekeeping (access to societal resources).
- The “Culture of Poverty” model: many Māori (and others) have taken up a “culture” or lifestyle which is more or less actively resistant to capitalism.
- The “Cultural Deficit” model: Māori culture has values that inhibit achievement.
- The “Pākehā Capital” argument: organizations in New Zealand have such a Pākehā flavour that they do not work as well for Māori.
- The “Contextual” model: Māori in some geographical (or community) situations face extra impediments than those in other geographical (or community) situations.
- The “Social Deficit” model: involvement in Māori social organizations/activities drains energy and resources better devoted to achievement.
• The “Social Empowerment” model: involvement in Māori organizations/activities generates fresh energy and resources for achievement.

2.3.4 Ordering/types of models

Reflection on the above list may yield useful insights about the interrelationships between the models and perhaps indicate what further models might be generated in the future:

• The list begins with several “structural” models that seek to explain differences in terms of the differential placement of different groupings within the social structure. The most straightforward of these is important but not very dramatic, whereas the last of the three listed suggests major forces might be involved in keeping groupings apart.
• The next set of models is essentially “cultural”, holding that the different world views and/or values of different groups are important in affecting their level of material success.
• Another model focuses on differential effects: there may be particular differences, which arise in particular situations which helps explain Māori/non-Māori differences.
• The last two models listed are an oppositional pair: each suggests opposing ideas about the effects of greater (Māori) involvement in Māori culture.

2.3.5 More detailed exposition of models

This section revisits the list of models in more detail and, where possible, examines the theoretical underpinnings for each, looks at issues relating to operationalisation and measurement, and indicates possible policy outcomes.

The Age Difference model: The age structure (and other differences between Māori and non-Māori) places extra impediments on Māori levels of achievement.

• Background: there are several (relatively innocuous or even subtle) ways in which Māori and non-Māori populations differ. The more obvious of these is that Māori, because of a higher rate of natural increase, have a “younger population” with a lower mean age. As a result, Māori have a greater concentration of certain components (e.g. younger children, teenagers) and a paucity in other components (e.g. older people): were these differential components to be “controlled for” Māori/non-Māori differences would reduce, if not disappear. Alternatively, it might be shown that certain social phenomena particularly arise because of the combined effect of the differential components: for example, the “control structure” in Māori communities might be affected by larger numbers to be controlled, but fewer to control.
• Underpinnings: the theoretical assumptions need only be straight “demography”.
• Issues: what characteristics need to be considered other than age structure and its more obvious implications (e.g. household size)?
• Measurement: the differential age structure (or other difference) should be controlled for statistically.
• Policy implication: while such differences are obdurate in the short term, in the long term they might fade away. One policy implication might be to implement
population policy (e.g. encourage limiting births) to try to even out demographic differences.

The *Class model*: much of the lack of achievement of many Māori is also shared by the New Zealand working class more generally.

- **Background**: in the world literature a major theme is the way in which minority groups are also often limited (even ghettoised) at the bottom of the social structure, and that many of their difficulties are shared by others in the working class (or even lumpen-proletariat). Minority groups are often more lowly placed in the class structure, as they are more recent “immigrants” without the education, “cultural capital” or accumulated economic capital to readily break into the processes of capital production.
- **Underpinnings**: this theoretical approach may be (but is not necessarily) Marxian in tone.
- **Issues**: which particular aspect of class is more pertinent (e.g. education, income, assets…) and also does the effect of class precede or is it subsequent to the effect of ethnicity?
- **Measurement**: ethnicity should be “controlled” by measures of class and only the residual attributed to ethnicity.
- **Policy implication**: long-term strategies are necessary to build up the ability of Māori to engage successfully in the Pākehā class system.

The *Recent Migrant* model: Māori have only been in cities a couple of generations, but will catch up with the mainstream in time. (Of course, Māori are in general tangata whenua so that applying the concept of migrants has to be carefully handled. Also many younger generation Māori are second or third generation migrants).

- **Background**: this argument often intersects with the class argument, although it may have a particular “tone” because it emphasizes differences that arise from the prior, “rural” background of the migrants. It may also usefully draw attention to the structure (including the temporal pattern) of relations between different migrant groups.
- **Underpinnings**: this model was emphasized most in the Chicago School of Sociology in the 1920s as waves of migrants became successively assimilated in the “host society” and moved up in the class structure.
- **Issues**: to what extent do migrant groups wish to assimilate?
- **Measurement**: this can be difficult to measure at the individual level (although number of years in the community may suffice for older respondents), and may require an aggregate group analysis.
- **Policy implication**: long-term strategies may be required to overcome deficits not overcome as the migrants confront the host society.

The *Capitalist/Structural model*: Māori have insufficient access to the main structural levers of collective achievement (e.g. economic capital) and more generally the intergenerational mobility processes of Māori do not work as well.
• Background/Underpinnings: this is a more solidly Marxian version of the class model. One argument is that “invisible ceilings” inhibit Māori advancement above a certain point.
• Measurement: the key measure is the extent to which capital is owned/controlled by stakeholders within Māoridom and requires a group analysis.
• Policy implication: that Māori need more access to capital to participate in the central processes of capitalism.

The Discrimination model: Māori are seriously discriminated against by non-Māori who retain control over gatekeeping (access to societal resources).

• Background: clearly there are elements of racism within New Zealand society and these attitudes may be actively (or more passively) directed against Māori by those with decision making roles in the hiring of staff, choice of tenants for houses and so on.
• Underpinnings: quite a large literature on “gatekeepers” emerged in the left-Weberian literature in race relations and urban studies from the 1960s on and has led to a variety of empirical studies that have validated this viewpoint.
• Issues: on the other hand, there is some “reverse discrimination” propelled by “affirmative action” programmes which differentially favour Māori.
• Measurement: it may be possible to measure (directly or indirectly) people’s (and especially gatekeepers’) attitudes and (better still) their behaviour, so that discrimination can be revealed. However, over time the growing cultural prescriptions on racist discourse (i.e. “political correctness”) have meant that racist attitudes are more difficult to measure as they are more often (at least partially) suppressed.
• Policy implication: education of gatekeepers and also ensuring that gatekeepers are sufficiently sensitive to issues of racism.

The “Culture of Poverty” model: many Māori (and others) have taken up (more or less actively) a culture that is resistant to capitalism.

• Background: it is clear that capitalism generates (at least partial) opposition and resistance from some groups, especially its victims, and the cultural values held by such groups may inhibit their extent of success in advancement. For example, working class people may prefer a “socialist” or a “cooperative” solution, or wish to directly and actively sabotage capitalist production in their workplace, or prefer to “retreat” into some cultural haven.
• Underpinnings: this approach largely stems from a “subculture” viewpoint.
• Measurement: Although capitalist-resistant attitudes may not always be easy to measure, some differences may be reasonably clearly demarcated.
• Policy implication: either those holding counter-cultural values need to be supported in achieving through non-capitalist routes, or they need “re-education”.

The “Cultural Deficit” model: Māori culture has values that inhibit achievement.

• Background: this is a more culture-specific version of the “culture of poverty” model, in which Māori attitudes are seen as more directly stemming from cultural values, rather than as a more diffuse reaction to their social situation.
Underpinnings: perhaps this view can be traced back to a holistic anthropological model which emphasizes cultural specificity and uniqueness.
Measurement: group analysis would be required, although analysis of the extent to which individual attitudes of Māori seem tightly derived from cultural values may be possible.
Policy implication: as for “culture of poverty” model.

The “Pākehā Capital” argument: organizations in New Zealand have such a Pākehā flavour that they do not work as well for Māori.

Background: sometimes Māori have difficulties, varying from minor to major, in dealing with established institutions, which seems to flow from a Pākehā style of operation.
Underpinnings: this model would be an application of Bourdieu’s class-based arguments that social stratification often works in a way set by dominating interests and rewards those who share styles similar to those of the dominant group.
Measurement: studies of “provider-provided” interactions would be required to pin down the ways in which difficulties seem to arise.
Policy implication: setting up either Māori “providers” or organizations with more distinctly “Māori” user-friendliness.

The “Contextual” model: Māori in some geographical (or community) situations face extra impediments than those in other geographical (or community) situations.

Background: it seems some portion of the Māori population have achieved a reasonable position in the New Zealand social order, but that particular “pockets” remain, for example in some rural areas, although such “pockets” need not be spatially defined.
Underpinnings: concern with spatial contexts at least comes out of developments in geography and in the general notion that capitalism is not one solid system but often operates in modulations or waves.
Issues: which contexts are those that most limit or advance Māori interests?
Measurement: access to large-scale, largely quantitative datasets are required.
Policy implication: targeted assistance to particular localities or groups.

The “Social Deficit” model: involvement in Māori social organizations/activities drains energy and resources better devoted to achievement.

Background: there is some evidence that involvement in Māori culture and social activities is draining of energy, time and resources which might otherwise be devoted to advancement; for example, Māori work or school absenteeism to attend hui may undermine their achievements in several ways.
Underpinnings: this is a version of the “cultural deficit” model.
Issues: what is the trade-off preferred by Māori against the observance of Māori cultural values?
Measurement: trade-off measures may be required which contrast the gains of observance against its costs.
• Policy implication: Māori observances of their culture might be encouraged or discouraged.

_The “Social Empowerment” model:_ involvement in Māori organizations/activities generates fresh energy and resources for achievement.

• Background: clearly, many Māori gain confidence from their involvement in Māori activities and this may spin off positively into other achievements.
• Underpinnings: this is the flip-side of the deficit model.
• Measurement: those who have gained “Māori capital” might be contrasted with those who haven’t.
• Policy implication: encouragement of involvement in Māori observances.

### 2.3.6 Conclusions

In order for understanding of Māori achievement to advance, further elaboration and critique of models such as those canvassed here are required, and appropriate empirical evidence for each – and for the set of models as a whole – carefully considered. These models will broadly guide the substantive investigations reported in the substantive portions of this study.

### 2.4 Māori in the “official social book-keeping apparatus” and surveys

#### 2.4.1 Māori in the “official social book-keeping apparatus”

Information pertaining to Māori is laced throughout the government information apparatus. In many situations where individuals come into contact with the state it is likely that ethnicity will be recorded. Ethnic information is obtained on many of the data collections of Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) and other agencies whose data flows into Statistics New Zealand or other portals. However, few of the business/economic data collected include Māori information (cf. TPK 2000b where they are interested to obtain information on the ethnicity of the ownership/management of firms).

Although for a while in the 1970s there was a concern to suppress the holding of information on ethnic characteristics, lest it generate discrimination, more recently there has been increasing attention to this issue as policy makers increasingly regard monitoring in terms of ethnicity to be important.

Ethnic data is now so widespread it does not seem the sheer availability of information on ethnicity is an issue, but the quality of the data certainly is. Worse, the definitions and quality of the data can change over time. Both of these issues are addressed in various reports (e.g. Te Ropu Rangahau Hauroa o Eru Pomare 2000; Kukutai 2001: chapter 4), and these points will not be repeated here. (Another example is Lawson-Te Aho (TPK 1998a) who suggests (on anecdotal evidence) that the Māori suicide rate is considerably under-counted.)
For much research, the main source of information is the five-yearly census and thus analysts are vulnerable to the exact wording of the ethnic question. The census is not only a primary source of data but is important as the population frame for selecting samples and the population base for calculating rates for other items of social information.

There has been much commentary on census data. The specific 1991–1996 wording changes were (Lang 2002: 1):

- more explicit that respondents could tick more than one group;
- the NZ Māori ethnic group was moved to the top of the list of categories;
- there was a new tick category for “other European” which included six subgroups;
- NZ European was replaced by NZ European or Pākehā.

Changes between 1996–2001 censuses involve moving back to the 1991 question but referring only to “Māori” rather than “NZ Māori”. In data-processing, in 2001 more categories were captured (up to six) and a computer-generated warning flashed up for coders to check if responses were genuine multi-response, rather than obvious respondent error in filling out the form (e.g. scratched out marks).

Perhaps more important than data-collection issues are the issues which arise as SNZ endeavours to reduce everyone to a single main ethnicity. All mixed ethnicities are assigned to Māori and then Pacific Island. The ethnic prioritisation model has major limitations (especially in Auckland) as many “multiple Māori” do not, in fact, designate their main ethnicity as Māori when given a choice (see below).

A general issue is that Māori response rates seem to be lower. For example, Statistics New Zealand (1996) reports that Māori and (even more Pacific Island) populations are undercounted in the census:

Table 2.1 Undercounting of populations in census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Census population</th>
<th>Net undercount</th>
<th>% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996 Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2 595 000</td>
<td>21 000 +/- 5 000</td>
<td>0.8 +/- 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>523 000</td>
<td>2 900 +/- 4 000</td>
<td>2.9 +/- 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>173 000</td>
<td>3 100 +/- 4 000</td>
<td>3.1 +/- 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>526 000</td>
<td>24 000</td>
<td>4.4 +/- 1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 2.4.2 Māori in surveys

This study is particularly concerned with exploiting the inclusion of Māori data in surveys (and also the extent to which appropriate surveys are available for secondary analysis). In particular, this allows the retrieval of information concerning attitudes and reported behaviour as well as attributes of households and individuals. There have been several studies suggesting ways in which research can be designed to facilitate
better coverage of Māori respondents. However, there are fewer studies of actual implementation of differences that arise from different sampling designs.

Besides the more regular government surveys (e.g. Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS), Household Economic Survey (HES)), particular one-off studies have also been carried out into Māori issues: most notably two surveys into the health of the Māori language. There is a group of recent government surveys, which can be drawn on. These include studies of Health and Disability, Time Use, Recreation, Standards of Living, Further Education and so on. An earlier study with much data on Māori-related attitudes is the Royal Commission on Social Policy (RCSP) survey (see Appendix Table 1.2.).

The RCSP survey used a stratified cluster design piggy-backed on part of the Household Labour Force Survey, covering the “usually-resident, non-institutionalised civilian population aged 15 years and over in private households in the North and South Islands” (Statistics New Zealand 1988: 608). In order to maximize Māori and Pacific Peoples sensitivities concerning intra-household sample selection, all eligible people were to be interviewed, although this had a deleterious effect on response-rate, and Māori and Pacific island households were “over-sampled”. Some 3050 potential respondents were aimed at, with 1795 being achieved. The response rate was 64%, with lower Māori and Pacific Island response-rates. The background data collected was minimal as this was “imported” from the Household Labour Force Survey.

Among the various academic survey enterprises in New Zealand, three are important:

• the New Zealand Election Study (NZES) (1989–1998: datasets are available. See Vowles and Aimer 1993; Vowles et al. 1998, 2002);
• the International Social Science Programme (ISSP) (1993–2001: data sets available, but ethnicity not always asked); and
• the World/New Zealand Values Survey (WVS/NZVS) (1989–1999: only accessible through published reports: see e.g. Webster 2001).

All three of these series of studies have been drawn on as appropriate.

The New Zealand Election Study has carried out large samples after every national election since 1989: for details see the relevant volumes. The NZES includes a measure of ancestry as well as ethnicity. It also includes information on enrolment in Māori electorates and speaking Māori.

The International Social Science Programme is an annual survey programme run by Massey University’s Market Research Department (Professor Phil Gendall). Mail questionnaires are used to generate some 1000–1200 responses: no further information on methodology is known. The International Social Science Programme (some years: especially 1995, 1999, 2000) includes a sole Māori /mixed Māori comparison. It includes information on speaking Māori (and further speaking it well), and closeness of belonging to ethnic group.

The data for the 1998 New Zealand Values Survey (NZVS) was collected by postal survey from a systematic sample from the New Zealand Electoral Roll, stratified by
age groupings. Oversampling was done of Māori and identified urban low-income residential blocks; 1201 valid returns (65.3%) were secured from 1840 valid names. It is claimed that, overall, the data compare very favourably with the relevant census measures, although clearly the sample is weighted considerably towards higher incomes. Of the 383 variables, 70% come from the World Values Survey, and the rest from the 1989 New Zealand Values Survey and from negotiation with funding bodies (Webster 2001: 184).

The victimization study (Young 1997: 13, 14) covered a national random sample of 4500 households with a further “booster” sample of 500 Māori households. (Response rate was 56% in the main sample and 66% in the Māori booster.) Extra data-analyses were also carried out.

Social science research in New Zealand is fructified by several major longitudinal surveys that follow birth cohorts, of which the more well-established are the Dunedin and Christchurch studies. However, their South Island location lessens their usefulness for Māori-specific research. Nevertheless, Broughton et al. (2000) report that in their original Christchurch-based sample of 1265 children they have the following figures in the latest interviewing round:

- sole Māori 52
- Māori and other 62
- Māori ancestry not Māori ethnicity 37
- Total: 151.

In addition, some studies have reported on their Māori-specific methodology, as follows:

The New Zealand Election Study series has been concerned with its coverage of Māori respondents (Vowles et al. 1998). Their 1996 study methodology is described as follows:

One thousand persons randomly selected from the Māori rolls were mailed self-administered questionnaires. The remainder of Māori electorate respondents were part of the panel or first interviewed by phone during the campaign … The Māori sample was weighted by party vote and Māori enrolment (1998: 212/3).

The same degree of undersampling is found within this add-on sample. Other years have similar designs. The 1999 survey included a Māori supplement and the 2002 survey a “main ethnic affiliation” question.

The National Māori Language Survey (NMLS) 1995 (TPK 1998) was a nationwide random survey based on 2441 Māori adults from 1550 participating households. Response rate was 81%. (The household questionnaire for this study included people’s relationship to each other and their ethnicity, a rare possibility for examining intra-household ethnicity).

The Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit (APHRU) has reported on Māori sampling in two of its studies. Dacey (1997: 42–45) reports on a CATI survey of the
general population aged 14–65 with a response rate of 76%, and which, when matched with 1996 Census data, “slightly over-represented females” but had a close match in terms of age groups and also in terms of region (although the South Island had a lower representation) and size of settlement. Respondents were offered access to a Māori interviewer if they wished. The Māori category of 512 from 4232 represents 12.1%, which is a reasonable proportion compared to the 15% figure for New Zealand at that time. Dacey and Barnes (2000: 12–15) obtained an 8% Māori representation from the general survey. In addition, they obtained a further 1147 Māori respondents by

...matching telephone directory information with the addresses of people who had enrolled on the 1996 general or Māori rolls and had indicated that they were of Māori descent.

Māori interviewers and a specially developed protocol ensured a higher response rate of 86%. Although the direct-Māori CATI approach proved more effective, the characteristics of this sample were less similar to that of the 1996 Census Māori population than the Māori portion of the random telephone study. The special survey produced similar gender proportions but was slightly older than the census population.

An ACNielsen study (1999) involved a partly randomly selected cluster/quota study of 200 Māori and 200 non-Māori households, involving an experimental design in which 50 of each group were given different combinations of 1991 and 1996 introductions and response categories. Interviews were conducted in areas with high proportions of Māori. The response rate was 56%.

In 1995 a major study of New Zealand women (aged 20–59) was carried out by the Population Studies Centre at the University of Waikato (Marsault 1997). The New Zealand Women: Family, Employment and Education Survey (NZWFEE) achieved a sample size of 3017, with a response rate of 61% and (especially pertinent to current purposes) an oversampling of Māori. A particularly important question coverage is the inclusion of both a question on the range of ethnic affiliations and then a main ethnic affiliation.

The private enterprise industry of market research has seemed to have been far less interested in ethnicity as a variable, although since little of the information it collects is released it is hard to know. Digipoll in Hamilton have developed a particular Māori-only polling operation.

Other datasets are more institutionally based. The main study deployed here is the New Zealand component of an international study. The Ministry of Education (2000) reports that:

“Timss-98/99” or “Timss-R” is a partial replication of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Timss investigated student achievement over five class levels across 40 countries, whereas Timss-R focuses on the year 9 grouping and provides trend information. Timms-R was carried out by the Comparative Education Research Unit of the Research
Division of the Ministry of Education, Wellington. The sample design involved selecting a mathematics or science class from each school of a representative New Zealand sample of schools. The students were assessed and questionnaires were completed by students, teachers and schools. One hundred and fifty-six schools/classes were covered, with 3613 students being assessed.

Summary

Statistical information on Māori is widely available. But particular methodological issues attend its use. There are issues concerning sample design (cf. Fitzgerald et al. 1996), questionnaire wordings and quality of information, which are particular to Māori, that have yet to be fully elicited from the studies which have been carried out. It was possible in this brief reconnaissance to identify some of the passages where these issues are talked about, but further methodological work is needed. In the meantime, when using the data reported throughout this study, the reader should “proceed with caution”. More detailed signposts will be erected where there seems to be a particular need for them. On the other hand, such issues should not be seen as overwhelming. There are rich resources to tap.
3. Characteristics of Māori (census data)

This part of the study mobilizes standard (mainly census) data to pin down the characteristics of Māori in terms of their geographical spread, and then in terms of the main ways in which Māori and non-Māori are “classically” different; that is, age, social class, and in terms of household characteristics.

3.1 Household and community demography: areas and general characteristics

This section provides background demographic and related information, and in particular pinpoints similarities and differences between Auckland / urban and other Māori and among the special study areas that are the focus for the qualitative survey.

Since the Second World War there has been a major shift in proportions of Māori from 8:2 rural:urban to the reverse. There is also a substantial population increase and gradual improvement in life-chances (see Appendix Tables 2.1.1 and 2.1.3).

The current Māori projections indicate a likely steady absolute and relative growth, up to a million (plus/minus another 250,000 depending on assumptions). Alongside this growth there would be a steady aging of the population (see Appendix Table 2.1.3).

According to subnational projections, the Auckland region’s Māori population of 133,000 might grow to nearly 200,000 by 2021 and while this would barely alter the proportion of Māori in Auckland – which would remain at about 12% – it would also barely increase the proportion of Auckland Māori within New Zealand as a whole, from 24% to 25% (see Appendix Table 2.1.4).

Whereas one-quarter of all New Zealand Māori live in Auckland, these constitute only some 12% of Auckland’s population.
Table 2.2 Regional Populations of Māori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Māori population</th>
<th>% of Auckland</th>
<th>% Māori in NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>43 100</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>133 400</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>74 800</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>15.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>65 400</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>20 200</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawke’s Bay</td>
<td>33 000</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>15 600</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatū-Wanganui</td>
<td>41 700</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>52 100</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>3 200</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>4 100</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>2 900</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>32 500</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>11 400</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>479 300</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Iwi characteristics: “Auckland iwi” at the 1996 Census

The iwi tables from the 1996 Census released by Statistics New Zealand are an interesting but limited source of information for facilitating further understanding of Māori (see also Gould 1996 and TPK 2001a). The data are provided for each iwi (or part- iwi) living within New Zealand’s regional council boundaries. In addition, those of Māori descent but without an iwi affiliation are included as a further group for each regional council and overall, and also several iwi that are artificially divided by regional council boundaries are provided (as well) with “reconstituted data”. The difficulty is that members affiliated with each iwi may well be scattered the length and breadth of New Zealand and it is difficult to pin down what this data might mean apart from reporting on the “virtual reality” of such geographically spread iwi. However, these data do, at least, allow examination of iwi characteristics and some degree of comparison. In particular, it is intended in a further study to use these data to replicate the comparative study of selected iwi conducted by Gould (1996).

The data on iwi include several characteristics on which information has not previously been available; for example, depths of generations in Māori households. On the other hand, comparison with non-Māori is not readily possible for several of these characteristics. The data available from the 28 tables has been reworked to fit into a single Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) file so different characteristics can be related to each other. Most data have been percentaged to allow comparison between iwi groupings. Statistics New Zealand has usefully provided medians for several variables, and these are reported where they are available.

It is not clear what the unit of analysis is for the iwi tables. Presumably those with several iwi affiliations appear as many times as necessary in this data. This renders comparison between iwi problematic. (The household data have a similar difficulty in
that they count the household characteristics of each individual Māori: there is no conception of a “Māori household” as such.)

The information in the present study is presented in two main sections:

- iwi characteristics
- regional differences.

### 3.2.1 Iwi characteristics

Information has been examined for some 121 iwi groupings for which the data is presented by Statistics New Zealand. The key comparison is the mean among the various iwi. This statistic, of course, weights the data in favour of smaller iwi, although it is usefully aligned with the conception that Māoridom is an affiliation of iwi. Even so, it is likely that the average of iwi characteristics are similar to the characteristics of Māori. (An exact comparison on a few characteristics at least needs to be carried out to check this point.)

**Numbers:** Whereas the average iwi had 14,000 members in 1991 by 1996 this had risen to 15,000, with an average change of 2.4% over this period (see Appendix Table 2.2.1).

**Where live:** As is already well-known, Māori are urban dwellers mainly living in the North Island (see Appendix Table 2.2.2).

**Personal Characteristics:** The data repeat the well-known feature of a “young” age structure, with a median age of 22. As a result only a minority are married, with a small proportion ex-married. Religious affiliation is also well-known with support for several key denominations and some 10% affiliated with “Māori” denominations, but negligible non-Christian religions. The data on languages available reveal the usual two-thirds/one-third split between Māori and English speakers. Fewer than 10% of all Māori are graduates. A high 40% are regular smokers. Data on involvement in types of unpaid voluntary work and the number of hours worked are interesting (see Appendix Table 2.2.3).

**Work-related Characteristics:** Some 55% of those in the age group are in the paid workforce. The distribution of jobs is skewed towards the urban and the “working class” (see Appendix Table 2.2.4).

**Household-related Characteristics:** A range of interesting data is provided. For example, households that are multigenerational are equally split between two and three generations (see Appendix Table 2.2.5).

### 3.2.2 Māori in Auckland

This table (see Appendix Table 2.2.6) provides a detailed breakdown of the iwi affiliations of those domiciled (in 1996) in the Auckland Regional Council area. The data presented also indicate the proportion of each iwi who lived in Auckland and the share this comprises of the total Auckland population. The main tribal groupings (e.g.
Ngapuhi) include some 40% of their membership in Auckland and constitute up to half of Māori living in Auckland.

3.2.3 Regional differences

Given the recent Te Puni Kōkiri report (2001a) comparing regional groupings of Māori, no further information is provided beyond an interesting table on the extent to which Māori living in different areas are multi-iwi. Broadly, just over 50% of all those of Māori descent claim only one affiliation, with one-sixth claiming two affiliations and one-twelfth three (or more); an average of 1.7. Just over a quarter of those of Māori descent claim no iwi affiliation. The number of multiple affiliations fades considerably in the South Island (see Appendix Tables 2.2.7 to 2.2.13).

3.3 Rural/urban and Auckland/non-Auckland differences within Māori

The first topic concerning rural/urban differences is covered by a Te Puni Kōkiri factsheet (1999). Some 83% of Māori are urban, compared to 86% non-Māori – 62% in Main Urban Areas (MUAs). This shows that fewer urban than rural Māori spoke te reo (one-quarter to one-third), fewer knew their iwi affiliation and fewer owned their property, but urban Māori had higher educational qualifications and faced higher rents and unemployment.

According to the Statistics New Zealand “Regional Profile”:

- Auckland is the most populated and fastest growing region.
- Almost 30% of New Zealanders live in Auckland.
- The population is expected to reach 1.6 million by 2021.
- Rodney and Franklin Districts were the fastest growing local authorities between the 1991 and 1996 censuses.
- Auckland has the most culturally and ethnically diverse population in the country.
- Auckland is internationally recognized as a major metropolitan city.
- Auckland adults are well qualified and earn the second-highest personal incomes in the country (a median of $17,818 compared with $15,603 nationally).
- As the commercial “heart” of New Zealand, Auckland contains over one-third of all business units (as at June 1997). Most of these are concentrated in the manufacturing, retailing and commerce industries.
- House prices are the most expensive in the country, with mean house prices in Auckland City being $343,133 for the six-month period ending December 1997.

Tables (mainly developed from the 1996 Census) attached to the Te Puni Kōkiri report (2001a) allow a more rigorous comparison between those Māori living in Auckland compared to other regions (see Appendix Tables 2.3.1 to 2.3.6). Auckland has the largest grouping. Its age structure is slightly younger, and it definitely has a smaller proportion of males and of Māori language speakers. It has more couple-only and fewer one-family and one-person households, and much higher proportions of two- and three-family and other multi-person households: presumably a reflection of the housing situation in Auckland. The home ownership rate is (slightly) lower, and
the rental rate higher, with rents paid appreciably higher. On the other hand, Auckland Māori receive substantially higher median incomes. Labour force participation rates are high for both males and females and unemployment rates low. Qualifications are much higher. While agricultural occupations not surprisingly score low, the higher occupations are well populated. Data on school-leavers suggest that Auckland schools perform around the average compared to national patterns.

3.4 Inter-regional Māori migration (1991–1996 migration patterns in relation to Auckland of Māori-only individuals)

The downloadable Excel files from the 1996 Census include two tables that allow some tracing of the migration patterns of Māori-only individuals between 1991 and 1996. It is possible, too, to track sex-specific patterns (percentages are calculated here on the total population). It is only people included in the 1996 census whose figures appear here. The tables deal with people’s location in 1991 and where they lived (de jure) in 1996, with differences attributable to internal migration (see Appendix Tables 2.4.1 to 2.4.4). The first two tables concern migration among regional council areas with the focus on Auckland Regional Council area. Of these two tables the first focuses on the fate of 1991 residents whereas the second looks at where current residents came from. The second pair of tables focuses on different types of “area” (Main Urban Area (MUA), Secondary Urban Area (SUA), Minor Urban Area, Rural Centres and Rural Areas) and again is focused on the Auckland MUA (which is smaller than the Auckland Regional Council area dealt with in the first table, but nevertheless forming almost all of the relevant population).

Most (85%) of the Auckland Regional Council’s 1991 population still lived in this area in 1996, as was the case for the Auckland Main Urban Area. Of the outgoing population Northland secured one-third (5% of total population), and in combination, Waikato and Bay of Plenty secured a similar share, with the rest spread around the remainder of the North Island: the tiniest contribution went to South Island regional councils (1% of the 1996 total population). In terms of the urban/rural status of outgoing population, some one-third go to other North Island Main Urban Areas, and the remainder are spread around other North Island settlements, but particularly rural areas.

The inflows are somewhat symmetric in general. Only 70% of 1996 Auckland residents are from Auckland. The sources are those prominent in receiving migrants: Northland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty and the other North Island Main Urban Areas; and more generally, other North Island settlements.

The Statistics New Zealand’s “Māori profile” (1998a: 28–31) provides other useful contextual information on migration:

Just over half of all Māori had changed their address at least once between 1991 and 1996, with just under one-third having lived at their current address for less than one year. Mobility was highest among Māori who were in their twenties in 1996, of whom almost three out of four had moved at least once during the 1991–1996 period....
On the other hand, most Māori people live in or around the same area of New Zealand in 1996 as they did five years ago. In 1996 almost half (45.5%) of Māori aged five and over lived at the same address as on census night in 1991, and a further 38.1% lived in the same territorial authority or regional council area. …

Of those Māori who moved, 70% moved within the same region or territorial authority … Māori and non-Māori rates of mobility by age were similar.


3.5 Differences between Māori living in the different territorial local authorities within the Auckland region: Auckland total and Māori regional profile, 1996 Census

The Urban Māori Disparities programme is mainly concerned with identifying characteristics of Māori within the Auckland urban region. This section pulls together profile information from Statistics New Zealand relating to this population. Comparisons are offered:

- between total and Māori populations; and
- between the several territorial local authorities (TLAs).

Although much information is available from several census sources, not too many provide systematic comparisons of the Māori (as well as total) population. The information displayed here is obtained from the Community Leaflets series of Statistics New Zealand. The information was downloaded and reworked to facilitate comparison. Some redundant material has been excised (see Table 2.3 below and leaflet information).

The Auckland region consists of several territorial local authorities, generally organized from North to South as follows:

- Rodney District
- North Shore City
- Waitakere City
- Auckland City
- Manukau City
- Papakura District
- Franklin District.

The following data are presented, with each grouping in the same order:

- New Zealand total population data, New Zealand Māori data; and
- Total and Māori characteristics for each of the territorial local authorities.
The information covered includes:

- population numbers
- age and sex
- ethnicities
- marital status
- languages spoken
- education
- households
- families
- employment and unemployment
- home ownership/rent
- income sources.

Summative pictures of residents of each of the seven Auckland territorial local authorities have been assembled from Statistics New Zealand Community Leaflets: Table 2.3. These provide information on both Total and Māori components within each territorial local authority.

Manukau, and then Auckland City Council, have the largest numbers of Māori. On many characteristics, Manukau (and Papakura) often contrast most with Rodney and North Shore (and in some features Franklin). The latter are faster-growing, have older populations, are less likely to speak another language (e.g. Māori), have more people with tertiary qualifications, fewer unemployed, higher incomes and fewer beneficiaries. Auckland itself does not fit so well into this bifurcation and includes Māori with higher qualifications and higher incomes, but also facing the highest rents.
Table 2.3 Total and Māori population characteristics (2001 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Rodney</th>
<th>Nh Shore</th>
<th>Waitakere</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Manukau</th>
<th>Papakura</th>
<th>Franklin</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>66 483</td>
<td>172 164</td>
<td>155 565</td>
<td>345 768</td>
<td>254 277</td>
<td>39 627</td>
<td>47 826</td>
<td>3 618 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NZ</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori pop</td>
<td>5 700</td>
<td>12 147</td>
<td>20 181</td>
<td>31 632</td>
<td>42 762</td>
<td>8 808</td>
<td>7 890</td>
<td>523 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NZ Māori pop</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori growth rate</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori 60%+</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori preschool</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-language</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori 1-language</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal qual</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 rd qual</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori NFQ</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori tertiary</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-family HH</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-person HH</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori 1 HH</td>
<td>4 653</td>
<td>9 378</td>
<td>21 948</td>
<td>21 984</td>
<td>30 531</td>
<td>6 522</td>
<td>5 907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori 1P HH</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple+Child</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Parent +Child</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori C+C</td>
<td>3 051</td>
<td>5 988</td>
<td>10 251</td>
<td>11 664</td>
<td>20 256</td>
<td>3 861</td>
<td>3 801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori C</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>1 440</td>
<td>1 776</td>
<td>3 657</td>
<td>3 195</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori 1P+C</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2 412</td>
<td>5 337</td>
<td>8 463</td>
<td>13 365</td>
<td>2 940</td>
<td>2 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori unemployed</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent $</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori owned</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori rent $</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori low income</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori high income</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori benefits</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Māori settlement pattern at Census Area Unit level (the micro-pattern of distribution of the Māori population in Auckland)

This section reports on the detailed spatial distribution of the Māori population across Auckland at the 1996 Census, and in relation to other ethnic groups. Only a very basic classification of ethnic populations is provided since this was the only data available at the finer-scale level. Separate tables are provided for:

- total numbers living in each census area unit;
- the percentage share each ethnic group has in each census area unit; and
- the percentage share each census area unit has of the regional total for each ethnic group.

In addition, summary statistics are provided of these features for the five ethnic groups covered, together with a correlation matrix of the interrelationships among the ethnic groups (see Appendix Tables 2.6.1 to 2.6.5).

Other publications have provided some details about longer-term trends. Friesen et al. (2000) provide maps and indices of spatial concentration and of dispersal of ethnic groups for the 1986, 1991 and 1996 censuses. They report that Māori are fairly well distributed among the population, as indicated by their aggregate indices, and also they suggest the spatial pattern of Māori settlement has remained quite steady over the decade covered in their study.

The descriptive statistics table for numbers, proportions and shares shows on average Māori constitute some 400 people per average census area unit (usually a suburb or large rural district), whereas the average European residential number is five times that, and those of Pacific people or Asians half. On average this is almost exactly 15% but ranging from zero up to 85%. (In comparison, concentrations of Pacific peoples hit 65% at maximum and of Asians 45%.) Overall statistics of share have little interpretive value since concentrations differ across a considerable range.

The correlation matrix shows that the percentage of European is negatively correlated with the percentage of Māori, and (even more) with the percentage of Polynesian, and slightly with the percentage of Asian.

Examining the particular tables shows that there are particular concentrations of Māori in areas such as in northern areas of Auckland where concentrations are in Wellsford and Helensville (each 25%) and Paremoremo East (20%; presumably prison population). West Auckland has a generally higher level of Māori settlement with peaks (of about 20%) in Matipo, Durham Green, Kingdale, Fairdene, Royal Road and West Harbour. Central Auckland has moderate overall levels with concentrations in Ōrākei North and especially Glen Eden.
3.7 Scale effects

The second part of this spatial investigation is to explore the consequences of the present-day Māori settlement from the viewpoint of different scales. The statistical properties are the mean, standard deviation, range and coefficient of variation. The scales were region, settlement type, and territorial local authority. There are some 412 census area units involved with this inquiry. The main statistical tool used to assess the effects is analysis of variance (see Appendix Tables 2.6.6 to 2.6.9).

The first table reveals a considerable overlap between these various properties when examined at the baseline level.

In general, it seems that the mean varies much more than other properties. Settlement type seems to make little difference. However, regional and between-city (territorial local authority) differences are considerable.

3.8 Differences between Māori and non-Māori

It is well-known that Māori and non-Māori differ in terms of several important characteristics: these include geographical location, age structure, social class, and household characteristics. Several subsections of this section attempt to pin down precisely just how Māori and non-Māori differ in these terms.

3.8.1 Age comparisons between Māori ethnicities in New Zealand, 1996

Professor John McCreary long ago pointed out the major consequences of the “youthful” age structure of the Māori population (and this observation has been followed up in many other studies). Among the downloadable ethnic Excel tables from the 1996 Census, one not only gives five-yearly age group numbers for various major ethnic groups in New Zealand, but, in fact, reports in detail on those Māori who claim single, double or triple ethnicities: they also supply median ages (and for males, females and totals): see Tables 2.4 and 2.5. The age groups are arranged into 15-year blocks to ease comparison. It is clear the Māori age structure is considerably younger. Other groupings differ in interesting ways: in particular the very young ages of the “multiple” categories, especially those with a Māori/Pacific mix. As a consequence their shares of population change according to age-group.
Table 2.4 Age groups (proportions in age range for Māori-related ethnic groups):
1996 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>0–14</th>
<th>15–30</th>
<th>30–45</th>
<th>45–60</th>
<th>60–75</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Single European</td>
<td>116 4393</td>
<td>35.553</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 216710</td>
<td>36.816</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 381 103</td>
<td>36.196</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Māori</td>
<td>135 897</td>
<td>23.489</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 541</td>
<td>25.717</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 438</td>
<td>25.116</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European &amp; Māori</td>
<td>74 571</td>
<td>17.180</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 298</td>
<td>18.413</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 869</td>
<td>17.810</td>
<td>42.24</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Euro &amp; NZ Māori</td>
<td>9 150</td>
<td>21.283</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 897</td>
<td>22.270</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 050</td>
<td>21.809</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Māori and Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>6 987</td>
<td>10.947</td>
<td>61.91</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 774</td>
<td>11.442</td>
<td>60.58</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 758</td>
<td>11.197</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Māori &amp; Asian</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>18.771</td>
<td>39.82</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 101</td>
<td>20.759</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2088</td>
<td>20.278</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Māori &amp; Other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>16.778</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>16.905</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>16.846</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot NZM and any ethnicity</td>
<td>91 812</td>
<td>16.965</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 205</td>
<td>18.133</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 017</td>
<td>17.563</td>
<td>42.83</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, New Zealand</td>
<td>6 024</td>
<td>8.924</td>
<td>66.73</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 907</td>
<td>10.282</td>
<td>63.89</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 934</td>
<td>10.079</td>
<td>65.36</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 777 461</td>
<td>31.695</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 840 839</td>
<td>32.878</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 618 303</td>
<td>32.304</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Lines are separately for Male, Female and Total.
Table 2.5 Share of New Zealand population in each range of Māori-related ethnic groups (1996 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>0–14</th>
<th>15–29</th>
<th>30–44</th>
<th>45–59</th>
<th>60–74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>32.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.96</td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>33.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Single European</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>66.80</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>78.36</td>
<td>82.89</td>
<td>65.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Māori</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European &amp; Māori</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European &amp; NZ Māori</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Māori &amp; Pacific Islands</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Māori &amp; Asian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Māori &amp; Other</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Zealand Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and any other 1 ethnicity</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &amp; Pacific Islands</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>49.85</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>37.02</td>
<td>49.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.62</td>
<td>50.39</td>
<td>51.16</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>50.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.2 Class differences

It was difficult to obtain 1996 Census data on occupation by ethnicity. However, data for the 50 top ethnic groups were retrieved, and allowed some depiction of class differences. Briefly, the Māori proportion in the top occupation groups is about half that of Pākehā, and in the bottom groups about twice. In turn, whereas European constitute some 70% of the top occupational groups and 60% of the bottom, Māori are only 5% of the middle class groupings and some 15% of the working class ones.

Table 2.6 Occupations and ethnicity (2001 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Pākehā % distribution</th>
<th>Māori % distribution</th>
<th>% NZ European of total</th>
<th>% Māori of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.3 Household and family characteristics

Family and household are essentially different yet overlapping categorisations. The former involves the characteristics of people in terms of marital status, parental/child and, more generally, kin ties. The last are groupings defined strictly in terms of their living together. The census (which is the main source of information in this area) offers mainly household information, although since information is collected on the relationships of those within the household, it is also possible to derive some understandings of the types of family occurring in New Zealand.

Household composition classifies households according to the relationship between people in them (references for this section are: Statistics New Zealand (1998a) New Zealand Now: Māori, especially Chapter 3, and Statistics New Zealand (1998b) New Zealand Now: Households and Families: more generally see Jackson and Pool 1996). A household is either a person living alone or a group of people who usually reside together and share facilities (e.g. eating, cooking, bathroom/toilet, living areas). Households are classified according to the number of family nuclei or individuals present. (Major types are one-family, two-family, three or more family, other multi-person, one-person.) At the next level of detail, households are classified largely according to the relationships among the families in the household.

“Economic families” are financially independent individuals and groups of people who are financially interdependent. (They include un-partnered adults without children as well as families.) Adult children are presumed to be financially independent even if living with parents. The main categories are one-person, one-
person + dependants, couple, couple + dependants. At the second level of the classification, different types of dependency (children and adults) are specified.

Other aspects of households include:

- extended families
- marital status of partners
- number of residents
- number of dependants, children
- age of youngest child
- sex of sole parent, also same-sex v. other-sex partnerships.

A host of information is available about household type. This report assembles information gleaned from various downloadable tables (see Appendix Table 2.8.8 to 2.8.14). Information is broadly available mainly in terms of number of residents (not yet covered) and household income. Households are classified into various types. In general, these tables are based on numbers of people in each ethnic group rather than on the household level itself.

In general, it is found that Māori families/households:

- are larger
- are “younger”
- have more children
- have fewer with high incomes
- have less access to superannuation, stocks, insurance etc
- have greater access to social welfare benefits.

Table 2.8 Summary of household/family characteristics (1996 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type household</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific Is</th>
<th>1996 Total</th>
<th>1991 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Family Only</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Family Plus</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Families</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Families</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiPerson</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Dwelling</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3+ Units</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-person</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 8+ persons</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned-Mortgage</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned without Mortgage</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent free</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landlord</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing New Zealand</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other central govt</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Objective and subjective differences between/within Māori and non-Māori (survey-based analyses)

This part contains rather more of the more original contributions of the present study. It draws on a range of databases in order to explore differences between Māori (and different ways of being Māori) and non-Māori in terms of objective, and then subjective, characteristics.

4.1 Indicators of disparities: the Māori situation

The extent of Māori disparity has been documented from time to time in various reports. The most comprehensive account was provided by Te Puni Kōkiri (1998b), updated in Te Puni Kōkiri (2000a). It is unnecessary to repeat this material in detail, especially as I have already discussed the “Closing the Gaps” literature earlier (above). The summary from this report provides a useful overview:

This report shows that Māori continue to experience poorer health status, lower income levels, higher unemployment, higher rates of prosecution and conviction, lower educational status, and lower rates of living in owned homes than non-Māori. The report demonstrates that disparities exist for Māori of all ages and that the causes of the disparities are the cumulative results of events that are experienced through a lifetime. (TPK 1998b)

Overall, there have been few reductions in disparity since the last report, and in those areas where Māori rates have been improving, corresponding improvements in the status of non-Māori mean that the gaps between Māori and non-Māori are not closing. (TPK 2000a)

Causes are indicated to include the historical events experienced by the Māori population as a whole including “asset loss, land alienation, and rapid urbanization”.

The report has given rise to a number of commentaries. Benton et al. (2000a: 25–26) suggest the following areas might be added to the coverage:

- justice/courts, the prisons;
- tūrangawaewae (a legitimate/legitimated sense of place);
- intergenerational disparities (language, culture, Māori-medium education, alternative schooling, e.g. elite private schools);
- mobility and internal migration;
- voluntary (unpaid) work.

Gould (2000) suggests there are methodological flaws in the presentation of some of the material. On the other hand, TPK have reported that SNZ have pronounced the methodology deployed as sound and that other reviewers have been happy with the approach adopted (see also my comments above).

In 2001, the Ministry of Social Development (MSD 2001b) issued a general social indicator report, which included for most measures how well Māori were doing as
opposed to non-Māori. This report extends and updates the coverage of the TPK version. A summary of these results as they relate to Māori is provided in the report’s Table 3.1.1, reproduced below.

Table 3.1.1 Summary of “Social Report” in relation to Māori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori male/female</th>
<th>non-Māori male/female</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>non-Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth (yrs) -male</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-female</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent disability</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent life expectancy -male</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-female</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth suicide (per 100,000)-male</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-female</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 births (per 1000)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschoolers (% 4 yr olds)</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-leavers with Bursary (%)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary qlfns in population</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose literacy (%)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse (per 1000)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation rate (violent)%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation rate (property)</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road casualty rate (per km travelled drivers)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (%)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate (%)</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with Low Incomes (%)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing affordability</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economising behaviours</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH crowding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported low sol</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Unpaid work (mins per day)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal unpaid work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone access</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in family activities</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have family/friends for meal</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter turnout</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Māori Cultural/Arts events</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori speakers</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori/Pacific medium education</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Ethclass? Class distribution by ethnicity

The two major clashing interpretations of Pākehā – Māori differences are that they flow from social class divergences, or that an essentialist cultural explanation is needed. (Other models are listed in section 2.2.) This section examines the major dimensions of social class in New Zealand and how sole and mixed Māori fall in terms of these in comparison to non-Māori. In particular, it updates an earlier argument (Pitt and Macpherson 1974) that the concentration of Māori in the working class positions them as an “ethclass” where social class and ethnic characteristics have become intertwined. (Again, section 2.3 provides data in terms of occupational differences between the two ethnicities, but the present investigation is more sophisticated and complex.)

The data is taken from the New Zealand International Social Science Programme “environment module” survey taken in late 2000 by letter-survey of a total sample of c1000. The numbers of the two Māori groups are very small and this, coupled with the postal methodology which clearly underweights working class people, means the survey results need to be taken as indicative only (see Appendix Table 3.2.1).

The variables included in the analysis are:

- subjective social class
- several measures of secondary and tertiary education (credentials and years)
- labour force status
- occupation
- sector
- employment status (including size of firm for those self-employed)
- hours worked
- whether supervisor or not
- income.

Not all of these measures are clear-cut measures of social class. “Weberian” measures include subjective social class, education and occupation (and perhaps income), whereas “Marxian” measures include employment status (and also supervisory status).

The results are generally as might be expected:

- Māori are lower than non-Māori (but mixed Māori similar to non-Māori) in terms of subjective social class and education (mixed Māori tend to be similar to Māori in terms of low categories);
- There are few differences in terms of occupation and hours worked (mixed Māori seem slightly less well off in occupation terms);
- Māori are less likely to be self-employed and more likely to work in the broadly governmental sector: with mixed Māori falling in between.
- Māori are more likely to be supervisors.
From the perspective of the weights of these various fractions, Māori clearly comprise some 12% of the lower class echelons, and about half this for middle class groupings.

### 4.3 Household make-up: ethnic inheritance and structure

#### 4.3.1 Ethnic mixes of households and ethnic inheritance

The 1998 International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) survey of school children provides some useful, and representative (for that age group) information on ethnic mixes (see Chamberlain and Walker 2001). The ethnic identity given is by self-identification and the respondents were provided with a wide array of tick-boxes to choose among. These data provide as detailed and accurate a presentation (within the limits that the categories are pre-chosen) of the current range of ethnic identifications within New Zealand. (The data are coded 1=No and 2=yes.)

The first table shows the main characteristics (see Appendix Tables 3.3.1 to 3.3.10). Pākehā is an identity claimed by 70% of the children, Māori by 22%, other European by 10%, with other categories being much smaller, e.g. Samoan 4%. The Ministry of Education used the standard Statistics New Zealand hierarchical classification rules to force each respondent into one ethnic category. This does not alter the overall results markedly, although now European is 62%, Māori remains at 22% while Pacific Island and Asian sit at 7% each. When split into sole and mixed Māori the Māori total is neatly split in half. Nearly 10% failed to record any ethnic identity. About three-quarters of the population have only one ethnic identity, with one in eight having two and only some 3% possessing three or more identities.

The next set of tables rotates through the several possible characteristics to indicate the combinations involved. Each of the ethnic categories in turn is visited in order to focus on its links with other ethnic categories. (However, those covered earlier are not repeated.). For Māori some 40% are also European, 8% each for “other European” or one or other of the several Pacific Island categories. Following from the Statistics New Zealand rules all summarize as Māori, and they are split between sole and multiple ethnicities. For Europeans, the largest crossover is with other Europeans (some 6% also ticked the other European box), and 83% of those claiming European ethnic identity wound up in the European summary category.

A factor analysis was then performed. Six factors were extracted and rotated, although several do not seem obviously interpretable. The first factor is a European versus Māori polarity. Then follow a “Pacific Island” factor, a “Chinese and other Asian” factor, a combination of Indian and other Pacific Island and finally “other European”, and an “other” plus “Cook Island” polarized factor. Broadly speaking these results seem quite reasonable, but the way in which Cook Island Māori stand out from other groupings is interesting.

(A factor analysis is a statistical procedure in which attempts are made to develop more abstract underlying dimensions that can provide a more economical and succinct picture of the relationships which hold within a set of variables.)
The two final tables report on major combinations. The key results are presented in the second of these. The largest group (failing to attain a numerical majority by a hair’s breadth) is “straight” Pākehā. “Straight” Māori is almost 10%: a similar proportion reporting no ethnicity. The next largest group is Māori-Pākehā at 6–7% followed by “Other European” at nearly 4%. Below this ethnic mixes split into a myriad of small combinations.

An important innovation in the NZWFEES (Kukutai 2001) was the inclusion of an ethnic prioritisation question. As a result of this question, the number of Māori self-identifiers fell considerably compared to the standard prioritisation. Some 83% of those with multiple ethnicities gave a single main ethnicity (the others remained “dual”). Two-thirds of mixed are Māori/ Pākehā. Kukutai reports that age-standardisation of the differences between sole and mixed Māori yields few major contrasts apart from aspects closely aligned to age.

Intragenerational shifts were also revealed. Such shifts were mainly those becoming Pākehā after being raised as ‘Other European’. Six raised as Māori became Pākehā and 12 raised as Pākehā became Māori, while nine became both as adults while being either as children while seven brought up as mixed became one or the other as adults.

More generally, Table 7.1 (Kukutai 2001) provides useful contrasts, and Table 7.2 compares Sole Māori, mainly Māori and mainly non-Māori (i.e. those with a different, non-Māori, main ethnicity although reporting some Māori ethnicity). In general, sole and mainly Māori women are very similar to each other and contrast with the non-Māori group: e.g. in terms of union status, income, educational attainment, Māori concentration, intra-ethnic partnering, and occupational status. Sole/mainly Māori tend to be lower socio-economic status, and tend to be similar to each other. There certainly is not the smooth profile of a Māoriness continuum as posited by Gould.

4.3.2 Traces of whānau family structures: living arrangements of Māori school children

The literature review section noted some of the results from the Massey University study (Fitzgerald 1999). Also, the IEA data can be called upon to provide a more systematic examination of the core components of whānau: types of Māori household and their linkages. The data in the present analysis come from the 1994 Population 1 (i.e. standard 4) study. Data were collected from each child-respondent in the survey about whom they lived with (mother, father, sister, brother, step-parent, grandparent, other relative and other), together with total household size. Only broad ethnic categories are available. However, there is a question on the extent to which English is used in the home which can be utilized to further classify Māori households into those where considerable (presumably) Māori is spoken, compared to those conversing entirely or almost entirely in English, and thus compare groupings within “Māori households” (technically households where there is a Māori respondent). (This item was also included in the 1998 round of the survey but the ethnicity codings for this study have not yet been obtained, and so this information cannot be updated.)

Almost all live with their mother: substantial proportions live with their father (77%) and with brothers or sisters. About 25% live with either grandparents or other
relatives and one in eight with others: some 5–10% live with step-parents (probably in reconstituted families).

A factor analysis is then deployed to reveal the main dimensions of family/household structures, with household size included as a further variable. This analysis reveals there are relatively low levels of intercorrelation among these variables (see correlation matrix): living with others has a particularly low communality value. Five components were extracted and rotated: not a large reduction in information from the original nine variables. The factors seem readily enough nameable as:

- living with other relatives, grandparents or others;
- living with step-parents;
- living with parents;
- living either with sisters or brothers.

The variables involved with the living with siblings factor also “load” with household size.

Bearing these results in mind, the data on living relationships were coded into three separate typologies:

- the composition of the core household (parents and children);
- whether either parent is a step-parent;
- additional household members.

The next step was to examine the link between the general family type and the two further aspects of household that had been identified. Sole parents are more often reported to be step-parents. Only a small proportion of two-parent households include a step-parent. Apart from single parent/multiple children households who have more “extras”, other types of household do not differ much in terms of extra members.

Differences among ethnic groups of children and within Māoridom respectively are then examined. In each of these the earlier results are reinforced. In particular, sole Māori children show the Māori/non-Māori differentiation more acutely than mixed Māori.

4.3.3 Conclusion

Although children of all ethnic groups live in household structures that are broadly similar, Māori (and Pacific Island) children are more likely to live in single-headed households but also likely to live in larger households. These data are only slightly linked to exploring the extent to which Māori households are set within the context of more-or-less active whānau, but this evidence does certainly point in expected directions, while also revealing that Māori households are broadly not that dissimilar.
4.4 Differences among Māori in terms of social background characteristics

Many studies have been carried out to investigate differences within Māoridom. In this section a variety of dimensions of differentiation are explored.

4.4.1 Differences between those on the Māori Electoral Roll and the General Roll

For electoral purposes (Westbrooke & Jones 2000) it was decided to impute the responses of those who did not answer the 1996 Census question on Māori descent (n=355,000) (in the corresponding exercise with the 1991 data non-responses were treated as non-Māori). In order to provide estimates, key variables related to Māori descent (for those respondents who did answer the Māori descent question) were identified using CHAID (chi-squared automatic detection detector): these were island, iwi, Māori ethnic group, the Māori descent composition of the rest of the household and age group. Other variables were ruled out because of insufficient predictive power overall: Māori language, Māori religion, born in New Zealand. Others didn’t sufficiently discriminate: sex, income, labour force status, regional council areas and urban/rural. It was considered that family information would be best of all, but this takes time to process and so may not be available for set calculation purposes. Iwi, ethnicity and ethnic household composition together provided good estimates, although no quantitative assessment is published.

4.4.2 Differences between sole/mixed Māori and ethnic/descent Māori, etc

It is intended in this section to analyse the sole versus mixed Māori material (from the tables) and compare these with the characteristics of those of Māori descent. In the meantime apposite available survey data will be deployed to establish the general significance of the phenomenon.

In particular, the intention is to establish the extent to which sole/mixed Māori and ethnic/descent Māori differ in terms of (other) social background characteristics. To some extent these categories will also be compared with non-Māori.

There is considerable data and commentary on these issues already available. However, few data on ethnic descent are available and most comparisons take one definition of Māori and compare the characteristics of this category with non-Māori, rather than providing a more systematic comparison.

The data displays of pertinent data in this section provide “profiles” which allow Māori/non-Māori or mixed categorizations to be compared. The data analyses reported here build up further such profiles but also redirect the line of analysis somewhat by casting ethnicity as an outcome (or dependent variable). (This does not imply that ethnic identification can in fact be “read off” other factors.)

This section draws on two main information sources:
The table (Table 2.9) provides a useful overview of aspects of Māori identity.

Table 2.9 Distributions in terms of different characteristics of Māoriness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Col %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“EUROPEAN/PĀKEHĀ”</td>
<td>3682</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MĀORI</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ASIAN”</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori ancestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3518</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Māori</td>
<td>4157</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori ancestry</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t speak</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does speak</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori electorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4458</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.10 Summary matrix of Māori-related social characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Māori Elect.</th>
<th>Feel close to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female, slightly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Younger, slightly</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Dsw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Non-married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady life partner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Kids</td>
<td>Sole parent, multiple adults family</td>
<td>Adults kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>NNI</td>
<td>NNI</td>
<td>NNI</td>
<td>NNI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>City/town</td>
<td>City/town/rural</td>
<td>Cities/towns</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(not metros.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in comm.</td>
<td>Fewer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country born</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed educ.</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age completed</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>16–18</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years education</td>
<td>Fewer</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qual</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td>Unemploy</td>
<td>Pt/unemploy</td>
<td>Fewer full-time or</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Unemployed/retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part, more</td>
<td>in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Health/ed</td>
<td>Health/ed</td>
<td>Health/educ, mixed Govt.</td>
<td>Pvt firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Agricult., elty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unemploy</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Hwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P’s personal income</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.5 Characteristics of Māoriness (and extent of involvement in Māori activities)

This section attempts to review existing data on involvement with Māori activities and culture. The aim is to build up a picture of how involved Māori and non-Māori people are with various aspects of Māori culture. It attempts to provide some “thicker description” of what being Māori might mean. In this paper the extent of Pākehā/non-Māori involvement with Māori activities is also explored.

There is a steady stream of useful profiles of Māori activities. There are a scatter of sources including the five-yearly reports based on census data and a range of other special purpose surveys carried out by various agencies. There is very little academic commentary to extend this although there is some case-study literature.

An important issue that has been raised is whether the variability involved in ethnic identification with Māori is so great that it undermines the legitimacy of the statistics. In turn this presupposes that existing research into the variability of Māoriness should
be mobilized. The several available studies that provide some useful insights into the variableness of Māoriness have been noted above in section 2.2.

4.5.1 Census

Official census data is limited. However, from this information it is possible to gauge involvement with Māori-specific religions/denominations and also use of Māori language. In 1996 some 1.1% of the New Zealand population was Ratana, its numbers falling by nearly one-quarter since 1991.

4.5.2 Time Use Survey

The Time Use Survey (see SNZ report on SNZ website: summarized from Table 48 of free tables) included a separate question (not part of the diary itself) on involvement in Māori Cultural Activities (MCAs). This survey is reported below in section 4.11.

4.5.3 Cultural activities

A more specifically “cultural” study was conducted by Creative New Zealand (in Association with the Hillary Commission: Creative New Zealand 1999). Over the period of a year 45% of Māori participated in an average of 3.9 different types of Māori arts activity; whereas over a four-week period 35% of Māori took part in an average of 3.3 different types of Māori arts activity (10). The major Māori arts are waiata (songs: 32%), karakia (prayers: 29%) te reo (language: 26%) kapa haka (dance: 18%), poi (dance with string-ball: 12%), karanga (welcome call 7%), whaikōrero (oratory: 10%), korero purākau (story-telling: 5%), raranga (weaving), and whakaahua (painting: 4%).

Māori women are reported as more likely to be involved (50% v. 38%: per annum) and to be involved with a wider range of activities (4.2 v. 3.2: per annum). The age distribution of involvement emphasizes younger (18–24 years 48%; and older 45–49 50%), although participation across all age groupings is similar. Some 12% of all New Zealanders participated in Māori arts activities, thus more than half of those involved (58%) were non-Māori.

Those involved with Māori cultural activities reported similar reasons for participation as other ethnic groups, with a lot more emphasis on maintaining and passing on tradition and skills (18%). The marae is the main area of participation (24%), although also the home, educational institutions and local halls are key ones too. Whānau involvement or other social involvement is high.

Women were slightly more likely to be speakers of Māori (64% v. 55%) although men tended to claim higher influence. Older groups are more likely to be speakers, with a slightly higher rate among 16–24 year olds. There is little regional variation but a definite rural bias. Those with tertiary education were more likely to be speakers. Those employed were more likely to be speakers, with a quite strong likelihood of speaking ability to be positively associated with higher occupational groupings.
The 2002 Cultural experiences survey (SNZ 2002c) found that over two-thirds of Māori respondents had attended a marae over the last year and that most of these had attended at least three times. Only a sixth of other New Zealanders had attended, and most of these attended only once. Māori respondents reported a similar level of involvement – about one-third – with the other areas of Māori cultural experience covered in the study, while non-Māori involvement is low across these areas (7–15%), with exhibition viewing the highest. Summing across the range of activities shows that marae visits are central to Māori activity, whereas for non-Māori a range of alternatives is involved. Female involvement tends to be higher than male, and for most there is a drop-off with age, and an increase with higher education level, and with more rural locations and in the northern North Island. There is little income difference, but the unemployed are more heavily involved.

4.5.4 National Māori Language Survey

An extensive study (of Māori only) is the National Māori Language Survey (NMLS) (TPK 1998b). This found that:

...although 59% of [ethnic] Māori adults speak the Māori language to some extent, the majority (83%) have either low fluency or do not speak Māori at all. Most Māori adults said that they found English the easiest language to converse in. Only 8% of Māori adults are highly fluent… (p. 10).

A particularly important set of questions involves the extent to which Māori experience certain situations as of greater Māori salience (see Appendix Table 3.5.5). The questions related both to speaking and hearing Māori in these situations. (Of course, a domain may be Māori without necessarily invoking Māori language but nevertheless it is likely a strong indicator of this.)

4.5.5 Te Hoe Nuku Roa

Massey University Māori Studies’ research programme Te Hoe Nuku Roa (Fitzgerald et al. 1999) has collected information on some 700 Māori households in Auckland, Tairawhiti, Manawatu-Whanganui and Wellington. (Although several descriptive working papers have been issued, more analytical work on the data is still forthcoming: e.g. Stevenson 2002; forthcoming).

Cultural identity is conceived as an amalgam of personal attitudes, cultural knowledge and participation in Māori society. Particular attention is focused on self-identification, knowledge of whakapapa (ancestry), participation in marae activities (customary social and cultural centres), involvement with whānau (extended family), access to whenua tipu (ancestral land) contacts with Māori people and Māori language (Durie 1998).

Four levels of Māori identity are conceptualized. Results reported to date divide the sample into: 35% secure identity, 53% positive identity, 6% notional and 6% compromised identity.
Te Hoe Nuku Roa found that there is a considerable level of involvement in some selected areas of health and education, links to Māori economic activities, involvement with Māori organizations, and level of cultural confidence. Other data on participation on Māori activities and identity are given in Broughton et al. (2000).

4.5.6 Conclusion

There is a broad common picture that perhaps some 20% of Māori are heavily involved in Māori activities. On the other hand, a similar proportion is distanced from such activities. The emphasis is more on culture and language: economically and organizationally fewer are involved.

Several decades ago, a scale of Māoriness was suggested (Ritchie 1956) which provoked resolute criticism. It is not proposed to emulate such a summative approach. Moreover, it is by no means clear what the patterning of joint involvements is. Nor is the social distribution of involvement with Māori activities well known.

4.6 Category jumping of Māori respondents: ethnic choice

4.6.1 Introduction

An important issue that has been raised is whether the variability involved in ethnic identification with Māori is so great it undermines the legitimacy of the statistics. In turn, this presupposes that existing research into the variability of Māoriness should be mobilized, so the extent of this problem can be assessed. Some limited, and some sophisticated, studies of the characteristics of those “category jumping” have been made, and these are summarized in this section.

4.6.2 Framework

An ethnic identification is one of the potential social categories open to a person. The array of possible categories is generally set culturally. Each person’s particular choice is, in large part, socially determined.

Assigning one’s ethnic identity is also a complex process. In many situations, particular ethnic identities may be entirely suppressed, whereas in others they are entirely fateful. Declaration on an official form is of some degree of seriousness. While (somewhat unconscious) practised responses are likely to prevail, there may be some influence flowing from the perception of the situation (e.g. a court, a legal document) and considerations of legal status and financial advantage may also be important. Sometimes, Māori have been the targets of institutional campaigns which endeavour to influence their identities; for example, given their past hold over Māori electorates the Labour Party historically has tried to move voters into general electorates. Electoral Commission campaigns reportedly offer incentives (to enrollers) to get people onto the Māori electoral rolls.

Causation is clearly circular. For example, self-identification as Māori is likely to lead to others seeing you as Māori. If you are seen by others as Māori, opportunities for
you to participate in Māori contexts are likely to result. In turn, exposure to Māori contexts and being treated as Māori will reinforce self-identity as Māori. However, these are far from determinate processes and there is considerable room for manoeuvre. Nevertheless, the limits to manoeuvre are set by resources available to a person, including their body features.

4.6.3 Historical developments

There is undoubtedly a large historical literature relating to changing definitions of Māoriness. This has clearly altered over time:

- In the pre-contact period, iwi-centred identifications of Māori were undoubtedly hegemonic in the absence of any comparison group.
- In the 19th century there was an emergence of Māori identity shaped by colonization, Christian conversion, an emerging socially constructed sense of Māori nationalism and the submergence of numbers under a rapid flood of immigration. Māori identity was spread in English language through a uniform schooling system. Iwi identity was actively undermined through a series of pan-tribal developments, like urban marae and other specific developments, and such as in 1962 when Māori committees replaced tribal committees.
- In the 1980s there was an undermining of Māori unity through devolution to iwi. Many urban Māori became somewhat marginalized from a growing pan-iwi Māori renaissance, which paradoxically also had strong iwi-level specific concerns.

These historical issues of Māori identities have been subject to many studies (e.g. Kukutai 2001; Pool 2000; Fleras and Spoonley 1999) so the comments here need only be brief.

4.6.4 New Zealand ethnic options

It is clear that simple dichotomies (Māori/non-Māori) used in such discussions no longer suffice. In some discussions there are three main categories: Māori, part-Māori and non-Māori. The specific details of the “part-Māori” have varied over time. Prior to the 1970s the categories were half-Māori and more, less than half Māori, and non-Māori. Prior (and up) to 1926 half-Māori were further classified in terms of their “mode of living” as either European or Māori. There are many discussions of how classifications have changed over time. More recently, it is possible to distinguish between “sole Māori”, “mixed Māori” and “non-Māori”. An important point about the middle category is that using Statistics New Zealand rules, mixed ethnicities involving Māori have their Māoriness prioritized (whereas an alternative procedure would be to assign each person proportionately to the ethnicities involved). Thus mixed ethnicities including Māori are “by fiat” classified as “Māori” which distinctly undermines analytical ability in further probing into varieties of Māoriness.
4.6.5 Recent data on ethnic choices

- In 1991, 29% of those of Māori descent were on the Māori electoral roll (cf. 43% in 1996 and by my estimation 77% in 2002).
- In 1991, 29% of Māori did not identify with any particular iwi. Some 22% did not know the name of their iwi (cf. 1996: 26% and 19%; in the 2001 Census some 17% claimed Māori descent without indicating an iwi affiliation).

4.6.6 Meaning of ethnicity

McDonald (1976) showed that identity among Māori was more fluid and ethnic-orientated, compared with Pākehā categorisations emphasized racial features and were more dichotomous. Being both implied being bicultural rather than involving belonging to a separate group. (Other discussions on ethnicity can be found in the writings of Ritchie, Metge, and Thomas: viz. Thomas, 1986 and Thomas and Nikora 1996; for a lengthy review see Kukutai 2001: 60ff). Kukutai summarises her study as follows: “Although there is consensus that descent is the core component of Māori identity, there is also an expectation that someone who identifies as Māori will possess some sort of cultural knowledge, or have a meaningful involvement in Māori networks, engendered through the connection of whakapapa” (p. 64).

The ACNielsen study (1999) also attempted to uncover the meaning of the term ethnicity by asking respondents to paraphrase the census question in their own words. Two major types of reply were in terms of “identity” and “ancestry”. Answering ethnicity questions (and also involvement in Māori activities) does not differ by community context (except that Southland Māori have slightly less contact with other Māori and were less confident in their Māoriness).

4.6.7 Category-jumping studies

Several exercises have been carried out into the extent of category jumping. (Some of this research is routine methodological investigation carried out by Statistics New Zealand.) Some studies have used projections or cohort aging to identify changes, while other studies have involved re-interviewing. (See Appendix tables 3.6.1-3.6.4.)

In their study Coope and Piesse (nd) report:

Using a matched subsample from the 1991 and 1996 Censuses, this study showed that there was an inflow from the non-Māori group into the officially defined Māori ethnic group between 1991 and 1996 of 23.4% of the 1991 Māori ethnic group. The corresponding outflow was proportionately much lower but still relatively high at 5.7%. ... In terms of the Māori descent group, the in- and outflows between 1991 and 1996 were 9.6 and 4.8% respectively.

(Presumably the flow is into ethnicity from descent: cited by Chapple 2000: also Statistics New Zealand 1999).
“In 1996, 82% of people with Māori ancestry also belonged to the Māori ethnic group, compared with 74% in 1991” (Coope and Piesse, nd). This happened across all age groups.

Between the 1981 and 1986 Censuses, “six per cent made ethnic origin inconsistencies, and these were generally respondents under 30 years of age or of New Zealand Māori ethnic origin” (Statistics New Zealand 1999: 24).

In the 1991–96 inter-census consistency study c23,500 records were matched. Some 25% of sole Māori in 1991 had moved to mixed in 1996; 12% moved from mixed to sole.

Multivariate analysis (using logistic regressions) of each category of movers were carried out (independent variables included: age, sex, tenure, geographical location, marital status, personal income, labour force status, qualifications).

The common factors which seemed to influence whether a person changed ethnic category between 1991 and 1996 were age and the proportion of Māori in a region. In general, older people were less likely to change category. Living in a region with a higher proportion of Māori appeared to increase a person’s propensity to change from non-Māori to mixed Māori and to decrease the propensity to change from sole Māori to mixed Māori (SNZ 1999).

The ACNielsen study (1999) carried out a design, which showed fairly clearly that the different response categories used in the 1996 Census strongly affected the ethnic response. In addition, this study picked up reasons for shifts:

- “I think of myself as Māori and didn’t think of the Irish group until I saw it listed.”
- “I have Māori and European ancestry as well as Irish and English. Two of the [census questionnaire] versions had different options to choose out of my European side” (ACNielsen 1999).

For the victimization study (Young et al. 1997: 13, 14) extra methodological work was also carried out into the ethnic response. Over 10% of respondents preferred to describe themselves as New Zealanders. Some 849 respondents were re-interviewed by phone (and in this re-interview the 1996 Census classification of ethnicity, which does not use the term “descent”, was used) of whom 20% changed their ethnic category. Almost half of these merely switched between “European” and “New Zealand European”. The other half were involved with an array of mainly small changes in which two Europeans, 29 of Māori descent and 27 mixed European/Māori descent became 24 New Zealand Europeans, 14 mixed and 20 New Zealand Māori. As the authors sum up, “closer examination revealed that the majority of the ‘change’ was more apparent than real” (1997: 13). Later in the book (1997: 14), the authors repeat that such changes are “on the margin”.

Those who changed category were asked why they had done so:
It emerged that the subtle wording variations between the two sets of ethnic descriptors probably had little or no impact on respondents, and there was no single, consistent perception among people of what, if anything, the word “descent” adds to the meaning of those descriptors. Rather, changes appeared to result from the fact that a number of respondents simply did not feel predominantly Māori or Pākehā and were therefore equivocal about their ethnic identity. For some, their response depended upon how they feel at the time or what had recently appeared in the media (1997: 14).

A few specific quotations are also included (1997: 14):

- “It depends on what I see on TV: whether I’m proud of being Māori or not.”
- “Depends on the situation: if it’s anti-Māori I’m Pākehā; if not I’m Māori!”

The New Zealand Election Study includes a panel component that allows the tracing of answers given (often to much the same questions, although codings differ slightly) over different waves of their study. Consistent with other studies reported above, there is some overall general change, but almost all of this involves switching between terms that are probably near-synonyms; for example, European, Pākehā, even New Zealander. There are some substantial changes but these are few.

Pool (1991: 15) reports a 1988 Waikato hospital census in which 65% of those identifying as both Māori and Pākehā could state no preference for either group, with the remainder splitting evenly into either Māori or Pākehā. Furthermore:

…only 1% of patients were unwilling to identify their ethnic group, yet no information on ethnicity had been recorded by hospital personnel for 6%. 28% of persons who identified themselves as Māori or Māori decent had been recorded at time of admission as European or no information had been obtained; 5% of those recorded as European considered that they were Māori, and a further 2% were from other non-European groups, or gave no response to the self-definition question; and 12% of those recorded as Māori identified themselves as belonging to another ethnic group. (p. 21)

An internationally unusual feature of the New Zealand electoral system is that there are separate electoral arrangements, because the change to MMP made the number of Māori electorates dependent on the numbers of Māori descent enrolling on the Māori rolls. As a result the number of Māori electorates increased to five from 1994 with another added since. However, differential recruitment into Māori rolls is not examined in any official study (data on this topic are available from the New Zealand Election Study 1999 but they have not yet been examined).

4.6.8 Conclusions: points concerning category-jumping

In sum:
• There has been some progress made in sorting out some of the methodological issues.
• However, it is essential to stop thinking of “category jumping” as merely error and start looking at it also as something to be explained substantively.
• In particular, close examination of ethnic consistency studies shows that there is a substantial core of ethnic consistency.
• The “error range” of ethnic data must be understood in more statistical terms, and old-fashioned essentialist thinking needs to be abandoned, without rushing to the opposite extreme that ethnic identifications change at whim. Bearing the above in mind, it could be estimated that the “range” of variation as of the order of plus/minus 5%.

4.7 Primary ethnic identities

Two major issues in considering the social construction of ethnic identities are:

• What is the range of categories among which people choose their ethnic identities; and
• How do people of mixed ethnicity combine these into “ethnic packages”?

Exploration of the first of these issues requires access to data wherein respondents have “written in” their ethnic identities.

In earlier decades, aggregation was assisted by respondents being asked to specify the various fractions of their immediate “descent”. However, current measurement approaches emphasize the range of categories respondents might identify with, without gaining any purchase on the weighting accorded each of these. The Statistics New Zealand “combination rules” are entirely arbitrary, and empirical work is needed to explore this issue. In particular, it is interesting to explore the extent to which respondents might choose a “primary ethnic identity”, leaving out “secondary identities”. (See Appendix Tables 3.7.1 to 3.7.6.)

The 1999 New Zealand Election Study included four ethnic identification categories that respondents are asked to tick (in as many combinations as they wished), a question concerning their “primary ethnic identity”, and respondents were also invited to specify their own ethnic identification if they wished. (One problem with the way the data have been recorded is that only the first 10 characters were recorded which may mean that more complex – and therefore long – terms were chopped off. This particularly may affect the term “New Zealander”.)

Some 10% chose to write in an ethnic identity, so presumably most of the other 90% were sufficiently happy with the pre-offered categories that they did not feel sufficiently motivated to add in a further term. The most popular by far of the write-ins was “New Zealander”, written in by almost half of these respondents. “Kiwi” was another popular term, and it should also be noted that “Chinese” often wrote in their identity, and that “white ethnic” terms were quite prominent, together with several other Asian identities, including the generic term “Asian”. Australians were quite
prominent. Only a few wrote Māori, but then this was one of the pre-offered choices. There were several combinations. A bunch of respondents gave variations on the terms “European” and “Māori” in combination. Others added either “New Zealand” or “European” as a prefix for another ethnic identifier.

Given the mainstay methodology of letter questionnaires, the ethnic yield is biased, and this remains despite post-weighting. (A separate Māori survey was carried out to bring up Māori numbers.) Thus Pākehā stand at 82% and Māori at only 11%, with a few Pacific Islanders leading to the remainder being predominantly “other”. Only a small proportion (about one-quarter) filled in the primary ethnic identification question, and those filling it in pulled the Pākehā and Māori proportions more nearly into line compared to other national data. As from other sources it was found that the proportion claiming Māori descent is about twice the proportion claiming Māori ethnicity alone, while those choosing to enrol on the Māori roll is about half of the latter. It is possible, using this data, to construct three further measures of differences between different within-Māori categories:

- in this data set fewer Māori claimed Māori descent than those claiming both descent and ethnicity;
- there are rather more sole Māori than mixed Māori; and
- the split between those on the Māori roll and those on a General Electorate roll is utterly even.

Finally, returning to the four pre-specified categories, some 90% claimed one ethnic identity, and 5%, two; 3% dodged answering, leaving a tiny handful with multiple ethnicities.

The following section investigates ways in which several of the pre-set categories translate into one or other of the set of “primary ethnic categories”. Those indicating Pākehā were particularly likely to translate that into a Pākehā primary category. The other three pre-set categories have much lower translation effects, however, varying between 50% and 60%. Otherwise there is a considerable spread. However, when the same data are viewed from another angle, from “primary categories” “looking back” into which of the pre-set categories generated them, a somewhat different picture emerges and the links revealed are very tight.

The next point is to rotate around the various combinations: in general it suggests that there is very limited overlap of ethnicity.

Finally several combinations of ethnicity are worked through to show the numbers of respondents falling into these combinations, and also the proportions of these falling into the various categories of the primary ethnic identification. The largest groups found are Europeans, Māori, Pākehā-Māori and those who didn’t indicate any ethnic category.

4.7.1 Conclusion

The pattern of ethnic affiliations in New Zealand is both simple and complex. At the centre is a large continent of the homogeneity of mainstream New Zealand. At the
edges are splintered islands of small ethnic groups and small multiple ethnic groups. Halfway between these two lies the territory occupied by Māori – itself then driven by several lines of differentiation.

4.8 Discrimination against Māori/support of Māori

It is incorrect to focus only on Māori, since almost all Māori live and work in relationships with non-Māori. It is important to investigate the extent to which Māori face active or passive prejudice and discrimination in their lives. A related question is to estimate the extent to which non-Māori support (or even wish to be actively involved) in issues and activities of Māori concern: which has been considered in passing in other sections. (See Appendix Table 3.8.1.)

Unfortunately, it can be hard to measure prejudice, in part because it is known that it is considered “politically incorrect” and even punishable by the Race Relations Office (RRO) to express some views and commit some actions. And there are few available studies. There have been some studies of gatekeepers, including work on employers by Spoonley (1978) and studies of real estate agents by/for the Race Relations Office (Maconald 1986; NZ Office of the RRC 1991; Moon 2001), which revealed a considerable degree of prejudice in steering Māori towards particular forms of employment and housing.

Trlin (1990) tapped views as revealed in the press. He reviewed those editorials (n=10) and those letters to the editor (n=182), which dwelt on aspects of Māori-Pākehā relations in the Dominion from 1 July to 30 November 1988. He concluded that:

Aside from a satirical piece on kūmara, the Dominion editorials championed the legitimacy of Māori claims and needs, and advocated an end to Māori subordination and disadvantage. This stance was well supported by sympathetic feature articles. Letters to the editor had a predominantly negative flavour. (93) [and] … reflected public issues and discussions of the time [fishing and land rights (36); the Treaty of Waitangi and the Waitangi Tribunal (18); differences in the needs and provision of services for Māori as compared with Pākehā (12); “Aotearoa” versus “New Zealand” (10); and a large general category (106) which encompassed letters … the origin and meaning of the word “Pākehā”, Māori gangs, aspects of Māori history, racism and the operation of the Race Relations Act, and so on.

… just over half of the letters were unsympathetic or hostile to Māori concerns while less than one-third were pro-Māori, and very few adopted a neutral position … and letters supporting or consistent with the editorial position were more likely to be prominently placed at or near the head of the letters column.

Another discrimination study (Colmar-Brunton 1993) showed that landlords know and admit to (24%) discrimination in rental accommodation.

Moon (2001) in a survey found that:
• Most Māori (n=50) who have sought rental accommodation in Auckland have experienced some form of racial discrimination, either from landlords or rental agents; and that a
• A high proportion of rental agents (n=36) are prepared to discriminate against Māori at the request of landlords.

Moon argues that these effects have shaped the spatial pattern of settlement in Auckland and have market consequences.

A recent survey (NBR-Compaq 2001) asked several questions on this topic. “What level of discrimination is there in today’s society against the following groups?” It was widely agreed (by over two-thirds of respondents) that there was much or some discrimination against Māori, but this must be put in the context that Māori (as targets for discrimination) were at the bottom of a group including beneficiaries, gays and lesbians, Asians, overweight people and Pacific Islanders.

It is also important to specify in what particular ways Pākehā (or non-Māori more generally) support Māori issues. Relevant material on this topic has been reported above. In addition to that material, Nicolson and Garland (1991) report a national mail survey of 225 respondents, concerning New Zealanders’ opinions about the role of Māori language in New Zealand society and the extent of support offered the continuance of Māori language.

While two-thirds of the respondents felt the language had a place in New Zealand society, only one-quarter indicated that the language should be used to a greater extent than now. Bilingualism in government agencies, bilingual signs and bilingual product labelling received minimal support. However, Māori respondents, younger people and women favoured bilingualism more than their European, older and male counterparts.

4.9 Māori intergenerational inheritance

Despite their centrality to the longitudinal study of societies, studies of intergenerational mobility have often been disappointing, as their results are seldom dramatic. Nevertheless, the staid, quiet dumping of romantic ideas about both extremes of “open” and “closed” societies can be salutary. Real life is complex!

There are also many methodological issues that attend intergenerational inheritance studies: in this section a “robust” approach is used, and further studies will need to address the finer methodological points. (See Appendix Tables 3.9.1–3.9.3.)

This section explores whether Māori parents are as successful as non-Māori in ensuring their children progress in the occupational hierarchy and, in effect, whether they “replace” or better still “move beyond” themselves.

In social science research on this topic of “status attainment”, typically a four or more stage sequence is used, with the attributes of the family of origin (occupation and
education) seen as shaping the educational attainment of the child, who then turns this into occupation and thence income (which is seen as the ultimate dependent variable). In this section the full sequence is not explored (and in any case parents’ education is not known), but will be added in during subsequent analytical work (however, a second, more-Marxian orientated version can also explore the extent to which entrepreneurial parents seem able to pass ownership on to their children).

In order to examine intergenerational occupational inheritance, attention needs to be given to the measurement of both parents’ and child’s occupation. In the New Zealand Election Study, data respondents wrote in their parents’ and own occupations (and also that of their partner where relevant) and this was coded to the standard four-digit level NZSCO occupations, and then aggregated to the one-digit level. From this point, several directions are possible. One approach is to use socio-economic status scaling as developed by Peter Davis (in several reports, e.g. Davis 1997) and to treat the data as being at the interval level of measurement. However, the approach used here is, instead, to recode the occupations into three even broader categories using solely education and income to guide this reworking. These three categories broadly correspond to the middle class, lower middle class/upper working class and working class. Further work on this scale, and the implications of using it, is required. A particular difficulty is the self-employed (e.g. farmers) who seldom report income that seems commensurate with their property ownership stakes. About one-eighth are (self) employed and 83% are employees.

In order to build up a “thicker” description, the main occupational groups were compared across several pertinent variables:

- education;
- union membership;
- labour-force status;
- employment status;
- sector of employment;
- tenure status;
- ethnicity; and
- subjective social class.

On all these variables the pattern is broadly similar, with declining resources available to people in lower status occupations. Data on mean incomes and education levels further back-up this picture. This exercise was repeated with the reduced occupational groupings. Small anomalies are perhaps:

- union membership, which is especially high among professionals and associated professionals – where it is more membership of professional associations;
- higher employment of the upper group in the welfare state;
- higher rates of self-employment in the working class;
- almost no differences in terms of housing tenure (the size and equipment of the dwelling may be another matter);
- relatively modest ethnic differences, although the proportion of Māori in the working class is twice as high as its proportion in the other two groupings; and
- relatively high identification with the middle class.
The analysis directly examines “outflow” from the parents’ class. Nearly two-thirds (62%) of the respondents who had upper group fathers were in that grouping, compared to only 17% of offspring who had tumbled into the working class. Both fathers who were lower middle class or working class nevertheless were able to support considerable movement into the upper grouping – 48% and 41% respectively. There are rising proportions going into the working class as you move down the father’s class standing. Mother’s class yielded the same level of prediction. The third pattern reported in the table involving partner’s occupation yields almost exactly the same picture as well. (Over time, class marriage linkages are softening.)

Since respondents and partners are randomly distributed between men and women, sex-specific tables need to be provided in future.

Of those in the upper grouping almost half (42.5%) came from fathers from this “class”, although a larger proportion (49%) had moved in from the working class. Those now in the lower middle class group had substantially (59%) migrated from the working class. Those now in the working class disproportionately came from the same strata (74%) with only 20% from the upper grouping. Mother’s occupational grouping shows the same broad proportions but far more muted. It was interesting to see whether there is a “class fit” between respondents and their partners: indeed, a broadly similar pattern is found.

4.10 Opinions and values of Māori/non-Māori

It is often assumed that Māori, along with other ethnic groupings within New Zealand society, hold values and aspirations that they should enjoy the fruits of capitalism and an advanced industrial society to the same extent as other New Zealanders. On the other hand, as with other minority groups within New Zealand society, for example, women, it is possible that Māori may have rather different views of the goals which should be achieved in life and the way society should be run. It is possible the values of Māori differ from non-Māori, and that their more concrete attitudes on various issues might also differ. It is more complex than a merely ethnic difference: to some extent Māori, who are disproportionately working class (among other differences), might differ in their views compared to non-Māori (who are disproportionately middle class), because of their “class mix”, as they might hold values and attitudes which are reasonably constant with other working class people.

Oddly enough, there seems to be little systematic work on this topic. Although the values and attitudes of New Zealanders are often probed by systematic surveys – for example the various waves of the New Zealand Election Study (NZES), the International Social Science Programme (ISSP), the New Zealand Values Survey (NZVS), and the Royal Commission on Social Policy (RCSP) – there seems to have been little systematic comparison of viewpoints (the main exception here is the Royal Commission on Social Policy, which routinely tabulates attitude items by an ethnic categorization of respondents). This section endeavours to uncover something of the range of similarities and differences among Māori and non-Māori respondents. It does not include any comparison of the results of these three categories:
• All non-Māori;
• Those of Māori descent, but not claiming Māori ethnicity; and
• Ethnic Māori.

4.10.1 The 1990s: a decade of the New Zealand Values Survey

This analysis begins with a decade-long comparative set of data (Table 2.11) gleaned from various pages of Perry and Webster (1999). The Perry/Webster formula (1999: 75) is that some two-thirds oppose special rights for Māori, with one-sixth each in the neutral and pro fractions. To their formulation it could be added that the extremists on either side might add up to about 5% each. While there is some similarity in attitudes over the decade, there is clearly a growing impatience with Māori interests.

The New Zealand Values Survey includes a report on the ethnic distribution across three attitude orientations concerning the society we live in and social change: radicals, reformers and traditionalists. “Māori national identity was more than three times overrepresented in the [radical] group at 20%” (p. 50).

Table 2.11 New Zealand Values Survey 1989–1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treaty should be strengthened.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty should continue to be dealt with through the Treaty of Waitangi</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be greater limits on the Treaty</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Treaty should be abolished</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support Māori land/fishing rights</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More or less in favour</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neither</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More or less against</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strongly against</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly increase assistance for Māori /Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some increase</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keep same</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cut</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greatly cut</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.10.2 Ethnic differences in attitudes and attributes, Royal Commission on Social Policy 1987

In 1987 the Royal Commission on Social Policy commissioned a survey to guide it in its deliberations and, in particular, to examine the New Zealand public’s experience of social policy, its perception of the fairness of the society, its social policy preferences, the values underlying these preferences and the social distribution of these (see RCSP 1988). The data from this survey is now some 15 years old, although it does firmly establish the attitudinal situation then. A major plus of this survey for present purposes is that it is not only soundly based on a good research design, but includes a solid Māori subsample, and distinguishes both Māori and “Māori/European” respondents in its reporting.
The design of the questionnaire was to elicit information about the experiences and satisfactions of respondents, and then their preferences and underlying values in relation to the welfare state services across several domains (health care, housing, education, crime, labour force participation, welfare support: with some attempt to ask about each domain in a standardized way to facilitate cross-domain comparison) and more generally in terms of government taxation and expenditure patterns, and more general values and views.

The data are reported in standardized tables (see Appendix Table 3.10.3) broken down by a standard set of background variables: sex, age, ethnic origin, occupation and urban/rural status – each taken separately. In this report, only the ethnic origin breakdown is examined, and since the total closely reflects the European category this is not separately shown. The “Other” category is largely composed of Pacific Island People. Differences between European and Māori, and between Māori and Māori/European have been calculated and are discussed below.

Methodological: Māori (as opposed to European and Māori /European) are more difficult to secure a high response rate from.

Attitudes to Māori Issues: As well as cross-tabulating attitudes by ethnic categories, other demographic predictors are available (gender, age, occupation and urban/rural settlement). Speaking another language was least common among the elderly and rural workers, and highest among service workers and, perhaps, among residents of main urban areas. In terms of speakers of Māori, levels of competency (the obverse of the rates shown for “a little Māori language”) are higher among the elderly and perhaps in main and minor urban areas. Two items were chosen to reflect attitudes to Māori issues, and these show a common pattern:

- women are more sympathetic (and perhaps the middle-aged);
- professionals, clerical and those not in occupations are more sympathetic;
- there are no strong “size of settlement” differences.

Hui Attendance: Men seem to attend more hui, and there is a strong age-related pattern (more elderly), and perhaps also a social class-related (higher occupational groups attend more) and settlement-size related (more rural people go) patterns.

Māori Language: When the attitudes of more proficient Māori speakers are compared to less proficient, the more proficient are shown to have much higher pro-Māori attitudes.

General: The overwhelming impression from the results is the very broad similarity of experiences and views on most issues, with a few exceptions. Māori respondents diverge most in respect to Māori-related issues and views on degree of government support. For the most part the Māori/European respondents fall between the Māori and the European responses.

Language: Rather high proportions claim to speak a language other than English (9% of Europeans, 51% of Māori, 27% of Māori/European), and of these, high proportions speak Māori (12% of Europeans, 98% of Māori, 89% of Māori /European) or another
European language (76%, 12%, 17%). In effect, this means about one-half of Māori speak Māori and 10% of Māori/European.

Health Care: Māori are slightly less (and Māori/European considerably more) likely to have received health care over the previous 12 months. Satisfactions and perceived quality and fairness of different components of health care are high and with negligible ethnic differences. Māori (and to a lesser extent Māori/European) are much more likely to support tax support for GPs, but the gap is strongly lowered when the question is repeated with an “opportunity cost” condition being placed upon it, with the European figure oddly increasing while Māori support declines. Māori (and to a lesser extent Māori/European) are far less covered by health insurance.

Housing: Māori satisfaction with housing is distinctly lower, almost certainly because fewer Māori own their property. However, housing preferences are very similar, with distinctly higher Māori levels of support for government support, especially to assist tenants. Māori/European have very high levels of housing satisfaction and their concerns seem much more orientated towards home-buying.

Education: Similar, and relatively high, proportions of respondents have received education in the last 12 months (especially Māori/European). Māori (but not Māori/European) were much less likely to receive tertiary education, and slightly less to receive on-the-job education. Satisfaction with education and perceived quality of education was high and similar (actually Māori respondents tend to be more satisfied) overall and for each level of education, apart from tertiary where Māori were less likely to be satisfied. Despite their slightly higher level of satisfaction, Māori (and Māori/European) respondents saw the education system as less fair and were more inclined to be critical on educational matters – especially in terms of insufficient job preparation, poor coverage of other cultures, but especially not enough years of education. Although substantial proportions of Europeans support kōhanga reo, the Māori support is much higher, and the Māori/European support not much lower.

Crime/Police: Māori were slightly more likely to have been a crime victim and have distinctly less confidence in the police (as do Māori/European). They reported less restriction in activities because of crime, but for those admitting to being restricted, more Māori said this affected their quality of life.

Unemployment: There is a very broad similarity between the ethnicities in terms of the causes of unemployment and the government responsibility, but (again) there are differences in terms of support for alleviation through application of taxes.

Welfare Benefits: Again, there is much similarity in viewpoints, except that Māori respondents are keener to see support for the elderly take effect at younger ages. Māori are more inclined to see support to carers be given, irrespective of the carer’s income, and higher in their support for government support for low-income families.

Government Expenditures: Māori respondents are inclined to support increased (rather than the same amount of) government expenditure in most areas (especially towards a bicultural society, housing, job creation and, to some extent, health, education and public transport). Expenditure on sport and recreation is the only area
where their generosity pales. Māori /European respondents tend to be more generous in general.

*Taxation:* Views are similar, although Māori respondents are more inclined to see a personal unfairness in the system.

*Factors to be Considered in Government Policy-Making:* In this broad area, Māori respondents have “across the board” higher expectations that wider considerations will be brought to bear; and especially that Treaty of Waitangi linkages be addressed.

*Attitudes:* Māori are more “liberal” in their attitudes, especially in relation to the honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi, the government’s generic responsibility for the people’s welfare, and Māori and women in “high positions”. The two exceptions are higher Māori concern with taxes and more self-reliance. Māori are also slightly less committed to supporting homosexual rights.

*Attitudes on Māori Issues:* Māori support runs at a solid 20% to 50% ahead of European support on this range of issues with Māori/European views making specific points: they support the more general availability of Māori teaching, but otherwise are intermediate in views or share the European view (especially on Māori health centres).

*Other Attitudes:* Apart from a higher concern with pornography, Māori tend to be more “liberal” in their views, with strong support for paid child care, invalid care and flexible work hours.

*Injuries:* Māori and Māori/European suffer a far higher injury rate; of those injured, more report interference with work and/or enjoyment of life.

*Memberships:* Māori are somewhat more involved in trade unions and especially in churches, but are otherwise slightly less involved and, in general, tend to be slightly less active in those organizations of which they are members.

*Assisting/Giving:* Māori are more often involved in providing unpaid help outside the household, especially for relatives, putting more hours into this. They are also more likely to give regularly outside the household: especially for relatives and other people, although less to groups.

*Spirituality:* Māori are far more likely to stress spirituality in life.

*Benefits:* Māori are more likely to draw benefits, except for superannuation. For those benefits targeted to the poor, the Māori uptake rate is three to four times that of the European.

*Satisfaction with Standard of Living:* Māori are slightly more likely to be very satisfied and less likely to be fairly satisfied. (Māori/European respondents are quite similar to European.)
Conclusions

Clearly some differences in experiences and values between Māori and European flow from cultural differences, and some from “social class” differences. The extent to which these experiential and attitudinal differences can be “explained” by these social background differences has yet to be established.

4.10.3 International Social Science Programme surveys

Several International Social Science Programme surveys have not only included an ethnic background variable so that appropriate cross-tabulations can be run, but have also included Māori-relevant attitudes and values. This is particularly a feature of the 1995 module that explored national identity. (See Appendix Tables 3.10.4.)

The key items for this study are the “race-related” questions scattered through the various questionnaires:

- There is only small (9% support from Māori for allowing parts of New Zealand to become separate nations (and even smaller support from non-Māori).
- Although a quarter of Māori are not at all proud of New Zealand’s treatment of all groups, in general the distribution of answers is similar across the four categories.
- Two-thirds of Māori respondents (and half of “Mixed Māori”) think it better that groups remain distinct rather than adapt and blend into larger society.
- Three-quarters of Māori claim to speak Māori at home, and almost half claim to speak it well.
- Two-thirds of Māori feel close to their ethnic group.
- There are very few Māori who ever refer to themselves as Pākehā.
- Māori are more likely to claim that race relations are getting better, that New Zealanders can be proud of our race relations record, and that efforts to improve the situation won’t generate worse race relations; on the other hand agreeing with non-Māori that more that “race relations are the same, just that the hostility is more obvious” and that the media stirs race relations issues.
- However, they strongly disapprove of the government’s handling of Treaty of Waitangi issues and want more action and larger settlements.
- Māori feel the media gives too much attention to Pākehā views and not enough to Māori.
- There is strong support among Māori for more control, with up to one-third arguing for separatism (e.g. in the justice system).
- There is definite support for more use of Māori language on signs, banknotes, the flag and so on.
- A substantial group see Māori culture and language at the centre of New Zealand life.
- There is no very marked prejudice exhibited through racial or marriage preferences (with Māori the seemingly least prejudiced group).

A major theme throughout these items is that Māori are particularly patriotic about New Zealand, have life-experiences far more centred on New Zealand (and their locality in particular), and also feel highly protective about issues such as immigration and “buying New Zealand”. Māori tend to be slightly outside the “mainstream”,
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though, on some matters where they dissent to some extent from some of the Anglo-Saxon values of New Zealand society (e.g. speaking English, respecting New Zealand’s laws) and even have a higher proportion express shame at some of New Zealand’s characteristics.

4.10.4 Māori/non-Māori electoral, political and social attitudes: New Zealand Election Study

The New Zealand Election Study provides an array of several batteries of attitude questions. These cover a wide range of attitudes and some values but it is difficult to readily present these in a logical order. This difficulty flows, in the first instance, from the lack of any entirely obvious classification of areas across which attitudes might range. This difficulty is compounded by the requirements of survey research in which there may be good reasons for dealing with some items at some particular points in a questionnaire, or for doubling back and dealing again with areas of inquiry already partly covered before. In addition to the attitudinal batteries, some “trade-off” questions are included which more directly force respondents into choosing between extremes.

Statistical significance-testing might check the data analysis provided here. Multivariate analysis would show patterns among attitudes. The present commentary focuses on ethnic differences, rather than what this information yields about the distribution and patterning of attitudes and values. Several items are of direct Māori pertinence and these have been extracted for immediate attention.

The data are drawn from the 1996 New Zealand Election Study (Vowles & Aimer 1998). (Since preparing this study, the 1999 New Zealand Election Study has become available but updating has not yet been carried out.) This study is undoubtedly biased in its coverage of Māori and taps the viewpoints of more literate Māori; but given the study’s serious attempt to oversample Māori, such deficiencies are at least partly compensated for (see Appendix Table 3.10.5.)

There are sharp and overwhelming differences between Māori and other respondents in terms of the Māori-specific items. On most of these items, the Māori descent respondents have views somewhat more aligned with non-Māori than with ethnic Māori respondents. On at least three of these items, the respondents of Māori descent are, if anything, less “pro-Māori” than non-Māori respondents – importance of race relations, making the Treaty law and increasing the number of Māori MPs. In terms of the importance of race relations there is clearly a broad consensus with all three groupings providing similar responses.

In summary:

- **Political Involvements:** there are no major differences between ethnic groups (there is perhaps a marginal lesser level of political interest among those of Māori descent).
- **Exposure to Campaign:** the broad level of reported exposure to electoral material is very similar, although there are minor emphases with Māori more likely to be
orientated toward TV than newspaper or radio material (again, those of Māori descent seem slightly to be laggards).

- **Importance of Different Policy Areas**: on many items there is a broad consensus, but on a few there are major differences with Māori placing particular importance on unemployment, tax rates, migration, health, welfare and industrial relations, while being somewhat less concerned about superannuation issues and the environment (those of Māori descent almost always have similar views to non-Māori).

- **Government Spending**: not surprisingly, these views spill over to the more practical level of government spending with Māori supporting increased government spending in the areas of health, welfare, education and low income workers (and more broadly across environment and defence as well), with only superannuation and police spending sharing common support-levels across the three ethnic groups.

- **Working of Democracy**: Māori (and to a slight extent, those of Māori descent) are distinctly less impressed about the workings of New Zealand as a democracy.

- **State of the Economy**: Māori and those of Māori descent are more likely to be unhappy about the current (in 1996) state of the economy (Māori are the relatively largest undecided group and certainly less likely to see the situation as good).

- **Relationship with MPs**: all groups have similar levels of contact, with Māori giving more polarized (either positive or negative) responses.

- **Electoral Attitudes**: the views of Māori and other respondents are broadly similar.

- **Economic Policies**: Māori are more likely to support various forms of control and yet (perhaps paradoxically) they are also more inclined to support tax cuts. (Business regulation does not attract any ethnic differences in attitudes.)

- **Privatization**: Māori are more inclined to support government ownership of the various organizations mentioned, with those of Māori descent tending to fall midway between the Māori and non-Māori groupings.

- **The Inflation/Unemployment Trade-Off**: Māori prefer that reduction of unemployment be prioritised, rather than inflation.

- **“Economic Voting” Issues**: there are complex patterns here – Māori and those of Māori descent are doing less well (and are more likely to blame the government for this), and yet Māori are more optimistic about the future (and the likely government impact on this).

- **The Tax v. Services Trade-off**: Māori are slightly more likely to prefer tax reduction than service increase.

- **Social Attitudes**: there is a broad similarity – although Māori are more likely to oppose the entry of nuclear ships; and are very slightly less tolerant of homosexuality – at least in relation to employment.

- **Government Welfare Goals**: Māori are more likely to support good standards for the elderly and housing for the poor, and are more likely to want free education and health; but are no more sympathetic with the unemployed. (Those of Māori descent differ in their support pattern, but on several items join with Māori ethnics.)

- **International and Social Issues**: there are few differences, although Māori (and those of Māori descent) are somewhat more opposed to United States defence ties.

- **Gender-related Issues**: Māori are keen on subsidy for childcare, “mothers’ wages”, and the reduction of wage differences but hold similar views on the other gender-related issues covered.
• **Other Issues:** Māori have similar views on abortion and republican status, but stronger feelings against immigration.
• **Distributional Issues:** Māori have a very slight tendency to “soak the rich” by showing higher support for distributional issues.
• **Industrial Relations Issues:** Māori are systematically more inclined to provide a “working class” set of attitudes.
• **Political Activities:** there is a broadly similar pattern, except that Māori are slightly more likely to approve more “violent” actions.
• **Attitudes to MPS:** there is some similarity, although Māori are more inclined to see MPs as uncaring, as people with no power, but are less likely to support the reduction of numbers of MPs.
• **Attributions of Power:** Māori are more likely to see government as complex, untrustworthy and run by big interests.
• **Trust of Government Attitudes:** Māori have similar (but slightly more untrusting) views.
• **Societal Attitudes:** Māori are more likely to see people as taking advantage and lacking willpower, while they prefer to blame the system rather than people and call for strong leadership.
• **Voting Behaviour:** the patterns of Māori and other respondents is similar.
• **Attitudes to Proportional Representation (MMP):** the patterns are similar, although Māori are a little less supportive of “First Past the Post” (FPP);
• **Attitudes to Voting:** Māori are considerably more alienated from the electoral system, calling particular attention to the duty of parties to keep election promises when they come to power (those of Māori descent tend to have very similar views to non-Māori).
• **Rules for Voters, Behaviour:** the patterns are similar.
• **Understanding MMP:** Māori reported lower self-assessments about their level of understanding.
• **Taxation Level:** Māori are more likely to want more services yet pay less taxation.

4.10.4.1 Conclusion

Over a wide range of issues there is a broad similarity between Māori and non-Māori views, although Māori tend to adopt pro-working class and even more pro-Māori cultural positions where items seem to fit these categories. There is a similar range of variation. There is also some ambivalence which undermines the overall consistency of Māori views, especially in relation to taxation and increasing government services: perhaps suggesting that the level of attitude consistency is lower among Māori (or that many Māori respondents are trying to reconcile difficult positions). Respondents of those of Māori descent provide complex patterns. In general, their position falls between Māori and non-Māori viewpoints but more often they side with non-Māori.

4.10.5 “Māori and the spiral of values”

4.10.5.1 Introduction

During the period of the Urban Māori Disparities programme Alan Webster’s (2001) account of his 1998 values survey (New Zealand Values Survey) was released and it seemed useful to summarize what this study conveys about New Zealand, and in particular Māori, values (the earlier account by Perry and Webster, 1999, had almost
no ethnic cross-tabulations). The relevance of this book is enhanced by its reporting of differences between two “ethnic Māori” groupings, and also the provision of a wide array of cross-tabulations with the data. The New Zealand Values Survey, not surprisingly, has a particularly wide range of attitude and values items. (Despite considerable public funding, and the rules for data sharing built into the international World Values Survey project, the New Zealand Values Survey does not release its data for further analysis, so publication of detailed results in this form is useful for other analysts.) This section, then, constitutes a compilation and critique of Webster’s findings and interpretations. The following section quotes extensively from the Webster’s book and reworks its detailed data (see Appendix Table 3.10.6.)

4.10.5.2 Conceptualizations

Webster generally sketches in a conceptual framework, drawn from much work in the analysis of values, to suggest that values can be organized in terms of a hierarchy of sophistication: from survival values to group consciousness. No claim is made that the selection of items in the questionnaire is particularly concerned to provide good measures of this framework, but it certainly is developed as the main explanatory framework.

The theoretical context is drawn especially from the following authors:

- Fernandez-Armesto’s magisterial overview of the Millennium, Belich’s portrayal of a New Zealand shaped by the meeting of the European and a highly competent Māori culture, Brown’s state of the world, Inglehart’s analyses of world values to describe culture-shift and the modernization-postmodernization dichotomy across the word, Orsten’s and McMutries’ analyses of post-corporate future, the Boswell and Chase-Dunn mode of the spiral of capitalism and socialism, Wilber’s “all quadrants/all levels” approach to valid knowledge for the future, Zohar’s bold image of the “quantum self”, and finally the spiral dynamics model of word cultural evolution, explained by the interactions of individual needs and the conditions of existence (Webster, 2001: 179).

A more straightforward and useful classification of values is also given (2001: 157) in terms of three spheres:

- **The personal sphere**
  - Religion
  - Morality
  - Environment

- **Social Sphere**
  - Work and Workplace
  - Social Capital
  - Quality of Life
  - Family
  - Economic Beliefs
  - Race and Ethnic Relations
• **Public Sphere**
  • National Goals
  • Nationalism v. Parochialism.

Webster makes no claim that this classification is theoretically useful in interpreting the results.

Based on two questions – ethnic background and ethnic classification – six “Ethnic National Identities” (ENIs) are developed: New Zealander, Pākehā, European, Māori-Māori, Māori-New Zealander and Pacific (with the likelihood that with a bigger sample, an Asian ENI would have been identified). This set of potential different views provides an important possibility for closer understanding of the range of different value groupings in New Zealand society. The “ethnic Māori” sample splits evenly (n=76 in each group) into Māori-Māori and Māori New Zealander subgroups. Given the potentially useful provision of two Māori and several other subgroupings the report seems a possible interesting addition to the New Zealand literature.

Besides cross-tabulations interpreted by Chi-square tests, Webster’s overall presentation of the data is shaped by second-order factor analysis – which reportedly yielded 11 second-order factors based on over 80 first-order factors. The main thrust of his data analysis is to seek to uncover underlying value clusters (especially hierarchical levels of value cluster), and then to relate these to social circumstances and ethnic outlooks.

Webster is sensitive to the appropriateness of his methodology to the Māori cultural situation:

…what we have done is Māori individual responses to a Western questionnaire that measures attitudes and values in relation to Western institutions. ... it does not in any sense claim to equate with or to compete with ... the work a Māori scholar might do, using methods derived from the culture, to answer the same general question.

Clearly, authoritative statements would need to be sought from each iwi and hapū. This methodological position, does not, of course, resolve the issue it raises.

**4.10.5.3 General results**

It is useful, first of all, to reproduce Webster’s overall summary of his results. Common values are those shared by a majority of the population (defined as about 70% or more). There are seven core areas of values and an equal number of areas of values conflict. It is important to stress that this is entirely Webster’s subjective interpretation of the key themes. The common values (2001: 161ff) are:
1. **Family Values and Sexual Morality:** “People agreed that marriage is not outdated and that there should not be ‘complete individual sexual freedom’.”

2. **Relationships between People:** “People agreed on the need for respect and tolerance between people and the non-justifiability of violence in a democracy as a way of achieving political ends”. However, “respect and tolerance as values clash with general unwillingness to live at close quarters with those whose personal habits or emotional state involve unpredictable, unacceptable or unmanageable behaviours.”

3. **Basic Human Decency and Support:** “It is overwhelmingly agreed that Government is responsible to ensure a decent standard of living for the old [and] to help provide housing for those who can’t afford it.”

4. **The Right to Work:** “High agreement occurs in regard to the need for increased government spending on employment and job training, on the importance of interesting work as a job quality, on the importance of feeling you can achieve something in a job and on gender equality in the right to a job.”

5. **National Feeling:** “Both pride in the nation and the belief that democracy is the best political system attract high agreement.”

6. **Value of Environmental Harmony:** “Humans must coexist with nature rather than master nature.”

7. **Belief in an Ultimate Being.**

On the other hand, there are several areas of value conflict:

1. **The Child in the Family:** “There is conflict about whether parents should always be respected, whether qualities of persistence, determination and imagination should be learned in the home, and approval of the single woman as parent.”

2. **Elements of Social Capital:** “…these include the importance of community organizations, order in the nation as a government priority, level of trust in other people, and various categories of people disliked as neighbours.”

3. **Redistribution of Wealth:** “There is conflict about reduction of income differences and about the then-government’s response to poverty. The rescue mentality or the ‘help up’ reaction remains, but independence is the overriding practical value.”

4. **Work Satisfaction:** “The right to work, including employment policies and the need for work to be interesting are key values [but] there is, however, clear disagreement on the importance of a feeling of accomplishment in a job.”
5. **Māori Rights and the Rule of Law**: “There is extreme conflict on the Māori rights value, which puts great stress on the core value of respect.”

6. **Environmental Values**: “There is intense conflict around increased government spending, with extra taxes, on environmental protection.”

7. **Religion**: “About half of those who ‘believe’ actually feel God to be important in their lives, and of those who do, not more than half again seek to engage with this enormous proposition in the form of religious practice.”

How do such cultural patterns fit with the theories about how they might be linked to specific group anchors? The study is able to conclude that:

…earlier levels of spiral development tend to be associated with the Pākehā, Māori-Māori and Pacific Island Ethnic National Identities, lower social class, and low education. Worldviews to do with individualistic enterprise and with the caring society tend to be of higher or mixed class and educational levels. Highest memes were strongly linked to the New Zealanders and Māori-Māori cultures and to higher education and middle class status.

(It seems likely that Webster means the last mentioned as the Māori New Zealander since it tends to be close to the New Zealander group.) Nevertheless, Webster goes on to suggest that:

Of all the ENIs, the two Māori cultures were the most broadly represented across the whole spectrum of value-cultures... *The Māori could well be seen as an example of a culture poised to integrate its wider-ranging cultural strengths and take the leap into vision-consciousness and integral thinking.* (2001: 224)

4.10.5.4 **Māori-specific results**

More Māori-specific results are touched on at several points, together with a specific chapter focused on the Māori-Māori subsample.

Webster states his most general position on Māori values as follows:

The relationships of ethnic Māori to Māori culture on the one hand, and to New Zealand culture on the other, are of profound significance. This was an empirical finding. (2001: 121)

Webster claims there are extreme differences between Māori and other components of New Zealand culture: “...out of approximately 200 value-responses on which comparisons with ‘the rest’ were made, Māori-Māori differed on all but 20” (2001: 122). On the other hand, he sees the Māori-New Zealander grouping as too close to the views of the New Zealanders to be worthy of any systematic attention.
A range of specific differences are commented on in the text, in sum:

Māori-Māori differed strongly from the rest on ... religion, morality and work values. Māori-Māori are more religious than the average. They are less likely never to attend church, and much more likely to believe in hell. ... Fewer Māori-Māori see themselves as Christian... [They] are considerably less likely to disapprove single parenting. ... Personal values associated with work suggest again a more communal than individualistic meaning of work...

(2001: 123)

The main categories of social values on which Māori-Māori differed from the average were community relations, family and social relationship values, the trustworthiness for society in general, and general optimism. Māori-Māori express far greater confidence and sense of the importance of community organizations... [but] unlike the non-Māori their confidence in community organizations runs far lower than the importance they attach to them. (2001: 124–125)

...Māori-Māori are at one and the same time twice as likely to think that marriage is outdated, but are more insistent on parental rights to respect from children. (2001: 125)

Māori-Māori are much less likely to believe that respect for the parent is conditional on parents’ behaviour. (2001: 125)

Māori-Māori levels of interpersonal trust are low:

Māori-Māori are well down in optimism about the future of humanity but, in seeming contradiction, are quite markedly more confident than the total New Zealand sample in the Green/ecology movement and very strongly in support of the principle of human coexistence with nature. (2001: 128)

Māori-Māori differed from the rest in term of social principles, economic principles, governance, multiculturalism, and confidence in institutions. (2001: 128)

The Māori-Māori have less confidence in democratic governance, believe in a greater redistribution of wealth but a less materialistic economic philosophy, yet wanting to protect the New Zealand resource from immigrant takeover; they display greater faith in both what local government can do and the degree of influence the ordinary voter can exert on policy and decisions; about half hold a radical view of the Treaty rights; and there is generally a relatively greater leaning towards institutions as a way of fulfilling needs. (2001: 129)

Webster provides several different interpretations as to why Māori might hold the views they do. The most-often cited argument is the retention of older Māori tribal values, especially in relation to collectivism. The widespread adoption of Christian values is layered on top of this. However, an effect is also identified of impact
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because of “suppression and cultural denigration and especially the loss of resources that came with imperialist domination” (2001: 126).

At a detailed level, almost all of the items in the New Zealand Values Survey revealed differences in terms of one or other of the Ethnic National identities, and the majority of items reveal one or other social class difference. Only a bare majority of items show Māori-Māori differences from the total, and in barely over one-quarter of items there is a Māori-New Zealander/other difference. However, these points are interesting as they seem to contradict Webster’s own interpretation – they show that Māori-Māori differences are less than he suggests and Māori New Zealander differences greater.

Correlating those items on which differences were found shows that there is a high correlation between class and Māori-Māori differences which suggests that to a considerable extent Māori-Māori differences may flow from “underlying” social class differences.

4.10.5.5 Conclusions

While this study presented interesting possibilities for the Urban Māori Disparities Programme, on closer examination, numerous difficulties emerged. In general, the standard of presentation of conceptual and methodological material is poor, with some sentences quite unintelligible and others wildly speculative. There seemed no obvious way the theoretical framework (if such a loose set of speculations could be presented as this) fitted the data. Even item-by-item inspection is not very convincing. Further, Webster’s presentation of the particular role of Māori value clusters is entirely strange, as they are portrayed both as “primitive” and as spread across the range of “levels”. This may indeed be because Webster’s framework is problematic in that he mixes individual and collective levels. Insofar as Māori still hold “tribal” values it is likely that, in many ways, they are seen as relatively “enlightened” since collective values are stressed. On the other hand, there are “closed” aspects to tribal views that do not fit well with the “closed” aspects of collectivities.

Although Webster’s study is a useful start for further considerations, it is quite flawed, and some deeper re-thinking is necessary. Building up a more inductively developed interpretation based on the data seems a good start.

4.11 Time use differences between Māori and non-Māori

The advent of a Time Use survey was hailed by many social analysts (especially feminist theorists) as a tool through which various subtle patterningings of social life, hidden to other methods of analysis, might be revealed. It is possible, then, that Time Use data might also reveal important differences between Māori and non-Māori in terms of how they spend their time (and related characteristics).

The Time Use survey was carried out in 1999 on a sample of New Zealanders, using a 48-hour time use diary technique. (In addition, background questions and some specific questions relating to Māori-specific time use were asked.) Nearly 50 free
downloadable Excel data files from this survey have been provided by Statistics New Zealand. However, it seemed that carefully selective sampling of these tables would reveal any major areas in which Māori and non-Māori might differ. The very many types of ways in which time might be expended are classified in the survey into 11 main types (personal care, and so on), further grouped into four central domains (“necessary”, “contracted”, “committed” and “free” time). My commentary largely focuses on overall differences between Māori and non-Māori respondents, but the availability of breakdowns in terms of social background characteristics allows rapid detection of where apparent ethnic differences might emerge. (See Appendix Tables 3.11.1 to 3.11.4.)

The first main set of reproduced tables compares Māori and non-Māori in terms of minutes per day spent on each of the 11 types and four activities. These comparisons are also able to be analyzed in terms of social background components – gender, urban/rural, age, labour-force status and family type. (It is useful that the component data is available as it allows possible social groupings in which divergence might arise between Māori and non-Māori to be closely identified.)

Average time spend on Necessary Activities (i.e. personal care) is precisely similar. Nor is there anything in terms of variation within subgroupings. In terms of contracted time (work and/or school) Māori are slightly less involved. In terms of Committed Time and Free Time Māori seem to have a better share.

At the next level of detail there are some interesting – but minor – differences: Māori are less likely to be involved in work, or in housework, but are far more likely to be involved in care of others, unpaid work, participation and entertainment.

Caring activities in the home have similar time commitments from each of the four ethnic/sex groupings, although non-Māori men seem more involved on some items. On the whole Māori involvement in caring in other households is far greater for both men and women.

Interestingly, it seems that people with disabilities are cared for within Māori homes rather than outside as in non-Māori homes. Support for committees and so on differs in detail but is similar overall.

The time rhythms of Māori and non-Māori seem extremely similar, except for less Māori participation in work in standard hours. Another Statistics New Zealand table gave locations, which showed that Māori only spend a few minutes a day on average in Māori-specific locations.

### 4.12 Relative household income adequacy

There is a particular way in which poverty must be modelled: taking this approach allows more valid comparison among ethnic groups. This involves the concept of “relative household income adequacy” (RHIA), in which available household income is related to household size (resources in relation to need). This approach is based on the assumption that most households are groupings in which income and expenditure
are pooled – although not all contribute equally, consume equally or indeed partake equally in the decision making. Since individuals do not necessarily comprise the same burden on household resources and there are “returns to scale” in relation to household size (e.g. a dwelling with 10 people only needs one stove, as does a dwelling with one person). The way of discounting for children (the main category assumed to have a lower burden on the household) and for household size is through a “household equivalence scale” (the main one used in New Zealand is that produced by the Ministry of Social Development: see Perry 1995).

The following discussion uses 1996 New Zealand Election Study data to construct a relative household income adequacy measure (although without a returns to scale calculation, and with income data which is crudely measured in category scales and without much attention to income details). (See Appendix Tables 3.12.1 and 3.12.2.) The scale was then chopped into half a dozen bands and the variation in the resulting measure was analyzed in relation to various measures of:

- ethnicity (specifically Māoriness);
- social class; and
- household situation (specifically type of household, tenure and stage of family life cycle – as indicated by age of respondent).

The relationships were first tested with one-way analyses of variance, and then using a multiple classification analysis (a way of displaying multiple analysis of variance results).

In all the tables, the measures tended to be in the expected direction, with the household income adequacy burdens being suffered by ethnic minority groups, lower social class categories, but also in a variegated way in terms of the various aspects of household structure, which were examined. Households with multiple children are the worst off, followed by multiple person households and then sole parents. Those owning housing are better off than those renting, those in prime-age categories better off than younger people (and to some extent among the more elderly grouping) and those living in big cities or cities are better off than those in towns or in rural areas. The impact of these various characteristics varies considerably, although all produced statistically significant results for the c3000 households in the analysis. Ethnicity measures produced the least effects, and social class measures only slightly more. On the other hand, other aspects of households were rather more powerful in predicting differences. There was very little difference between the different measures of ethnicity in terms of differentiating levels of household economic burden.

The multivariate analysis endeavours to assess the overall effect of sets of predictors. The set used here includes a measure of Māoriness, and measures of occupation (grouped into broad “class” categories), highest educational qualification, family type, housing tenure, type of community, and age group. The cumulative results were remarkably as might be expected, with almost no difference between the different measures of ethnicity. Overall, predictability of income adequacy was reasonably high (with multiple correlations of around 0.35) and with the main explanatory burden being borne by measures of family type, tenure, and age, together with some slight social class effects. The measures of Māoriness had little explanatory “pulling
power”, and this was reduced still further once the other variables in the equation were controlled for. It follows from this line of argument that it is the tendency of Māori households to be in rental accommodation, to be younger, and to be larger that mostly explains their economic difficulties, rather than the fact that they are Māori.

On the other hand, it is possible to explore other statistical models in which the “common variance” in the equations is forcibly assigned to the Māori measure. Either approach cannot be preferred on statistical grounds alone. One advantage of the models reported here is their policy implications. The way to increased Māori prosperity may very well lie in the improving of their tenure, household and life cycle stage situation.

4.13 Māori social and political capital

It is not just the attributes and resources which an ethnic group holds, but also the social and political resources or capital they possess, that can assist them in achieving the maximum return on their investment (across economic, cultural or social spheres). Part of social capital is organizational and involves the organizational capacities to accomplish collective actions (see elsewhere in this study for material on Māori organizations in Auckland). Political capital is also important, in the forms of both voting power and also interest-group activities and mass protest meetings. Another form of leverage possibility is the availability of social or network capital. This is the topic of the 2001 International Social Science Programme module and it is intended that the network data will be interrogated from an ethnic perspective as soon as they are available.

Māori tend to have larger numbers of siblings and to have more contact with a sister (as with Pākehā), whereas mixed Māori are more likely to have contact with a brother than a sister. Contact with siblings is marginally higher. The ethnic categories don’t differ in terms of numbers of children. Contact with sons/daughters is higher, and more likely to involve sons (as it is for Pākehā/Māori). Contact with in-laws doesn’t differ, but there is higher contract with uncles/aunts, cousins and with nephews/nieces. Godparents seem an irrelevant category. There are no differences in terms of numbers of friends in any of the three categories. Māori are far more likely to choose relatives as close friends, and to visit them more often.

Respondents were asked a range of questions about their involvement with organizations. For most of these areas of organizational involvement Māori activity is slightly greater than for Pākehā (with the exceptions of political party and trade union/professional activities where there is no significant difference).

The final component of the study involved “helping behaviour”: most of these questions allowed up to two answers to be provided. Māori are less likely to ask for help from partners and more likely to ask help from mothers and/or close friends (dealing with depression seemed to be on a different footing). Māori seem more likely to be involved with helping others.
The information on networks was followed by data on attitudes towards the characteristics by which close friends are chosen. Māori tend to emphasise each of the factors mentioned, apart from the “good company” criterion whose importance they share equally with Pākehā. Māori show a heightened level of responsibility for family and also friends; and also expect some reciprocity. Māori (and more particularly Pākehā/Māori) are more likely to report demands from relatives that are too high. Māori were far more likely not to trust more than a few, to feel that others are out to take advantage of them, and be involved in more political discussion with close friends. The image is of Māori tending to have a close but small group of friends.

Māori report higher levels of attribution of state responsibilities (with the mixed group part-way in-between). There are no strong differences in terms of feeling that Government is responsive.

There seems to be little difference in terms of happiness. While more Māori report being “very happy”, this is “compensated for” by slightly fewer who are “fairly happy”. The mixed group exhibits most unhappiness.

4.14 Everyday life as Māori

Little is known about how Māori experience everyday life in New Zealand. In her study of a Wellington street Tilbury (1998: also Tilbury and Lloyd 2001) report there is still overt racist overtones in many conversations of Pākehā New Zealanders. As a result many Māori express guardedness in their conversations.

Other anecdotal material on the everyday experience of being Māori is presented in Bev James’s (2000) summary review of earlier studies of police and Māori attitudes to each other. These studies had found, through focus group work, that because it was considered that police had negative perceptions of Māori (seeing them as essentially “criminal”) that Māori distrusted police and felt the institution was inimical to Māori. However, exceptions among police were noted (e.g. Youth aid or older officers)

Other relevant material about the experiences of Māori may well be gleaned from reports such as TPK’s review (2001d) of the “Strengthening Families” programme on collaborative case management.
5. Institutional descriptions and analyses

This section of the study draws on a range of social book-keeping data to depict the place that Māori seem to occupy in terms of their interactions with institutions. Some of the data have been obtained in disaggregated form and are analysed in more depth, in order to reveal interactions between ethnicity and other variables (e.g. social class).

5.1 Housing: ethnicities of Housing New Zealand tenants in the Auckland region

One of the crucial areas of household expenditure concerns housing costs. Owners may be faced with high costs as they pay off mortgages and meet maintenance bills but they are, at least, (usually) building up assets. Especially those tenants living in high-cost situations can have their whole household budgets sharply affected by rental costs. Some highly vulnerable households may be rendered homeless. Over time, several forms of government intervention have endeavoured to reduce these costs with state-provided housing being one of the major planks in the post Second World War New Zealand welfare state. However, this form of provision was sharply reduced under the Rogernomics regime, when steps were taken to increase rentals to “market” rates, and sell off housing stock. Nevertheless, Housing New Zealand remains a major landlord in New Zealand, and undoubtedly contributes to the alleviation of social/economic hardship in the region. A further effect of state housing provision can be to influence the geographical shaping of settlement, including in terms of ethnicity. Of the classic models of residential differentiation the “multiple nuclei” model posits that residential patterns may (in part) be shaped by the spatial pattern of the provision of state housing. This section establishes, for the Auckland region only, the extent to which Housing New Zealand provides housing for disadvantaged ethnic groups.

Data was kindly supplied by the Head Office of Housing New Zealand, and it refers to December 2001 (see Appendix Table 4.1.1). Most tenants had a recorded ethnicity, although a considerable minority do not (perhaps longer-standing tenants who go back to when ethnicities were less adequately recorded). Data are separately supplied for each of 15 offices in the Auckland region. The ordering of the Housing New Zealand offices is organized to fit the more normal (Statistics New Zealand) geographical sequence.

Of some 60,000 tenancies in New Zealand as a whole, nearly 25,000 are in the Auckland region, which is administered through some 15 different local offices. Each office administers between 750 and some 2500 tenancies. The overall proportions range across European, Māori, Pacific Island, Other, and then “not-entered” and “not-stated”. The proportions in each ethnic group vary considerably among offices: Grey Lynn and Takapuna have the highest proportions of Europeans/ Pākehā (nearly one-half of their tenancies) while some other offices have only a tiny minority recorded as European. The total of European tenants is evenly spread across several offices, apart from the offices in Manurewa, Otara, Papakura, Papatoetoe, Mangere and Otahuhu. The largest Māori proportions are in Papakura (nearly 60%) and Manurewa, with the likelihood that the high proportion of “not-stated” in Crockers/Papatoetoe to be investigated, this would yield a high Māori proportion. The highest Māori
concentrations are in Manurewa, Otara and Papakura. There are high Pacific Island proportions in Otara, Mangere, Mt Roskill, and Otahuhu with an especially high concentration in Papatoetoe.

In order to relate these patterns to the wide social structure it would be necessary to relate these data to the ethnic distributions in the various territories served by these offices, and to ascertain more about the other characteristics of the households served by Housing New Zealand. Census data can be pressed into service for this purpose.

### 5.2 Education

#### 5.2.1 Māori in the school statistics

The Ministry of Education issues a wide range of data on schools, which it collects annually, and it also has readily accessible Time Series data. Much of this information on school children is broken down by ethnicity. Broadly, primary (and composite) schools can be contrasted with secondary (and specialist). This section of the report addresses only the overlap between social class situation of school and ethnicity and ethnic differences in suspensions and expulsions (see Appendix Tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.13).

(Note: The MOE has a measure of the socio-economic background of schools. The decile scores range from 1 to 10: with 1 being the score for the bottom decile. The scale is measured in terms of social background characteristics of mesh-blocks in which parents of school-children live, with extent of Māori and Pasifika in these mesh-blocks part of the measurement.)

Māori (40%), and even more so Pacific (50%), students are concentrated in low socio-economic status-located primary schools, as opposed to 20% of all schools which are in this category. Only 10% of European primary pupils study at low-decile schools. The pattern at secondary school level is very similar. Moreover, both girls and boys face similar situations.

#### 5.2.2 School suspensions/expulsions

The Ministry of Education assembles data on the reasons reported by schools for their suspension or expulsion of pupils. For males, the Māori rate is twice that of Europeans (with the Pacific rate only slightly behind this). Apart perhaps for arson and sexual misbehaviour, Māori rates are greater for each category recorded, and especially for drugs, and violent behaviour. For girls the rates are some three times higher.
5.2.3 School leaver (output) characteristics of Māori by school attributes

Since this topic has been covered in many other studies, it was not included again here. (Other related data for example on number of years at school, are also available.) The situation over the last decade has been quite stable.

5.2.4 Educational aspirations of Māori and non-Māori students

Education is clearly one of the most important factors in shaping people’s future careers – hence their interest in seeking the highest possible educational qualifications. If young people are discouraged from seeking educational, and hence occupational, advancement (commensurate with their talents) at this early stage in their careers, the longer term effect may be particularly fateful. Educational aspirations and other decisions about careers are not entirely individualistic, but are shaped and reinforced by group processes and contexts.

The 1998, Year 9 (New Zealand form 3: 13-year-olds) IEA data are used to investigate this issue. This analysis rests on the fragile base of a single question about future education plans. (Because the questionnaires are self-administered in classroom situations but the study is also international, a strong degree of standardization was doubtless required. However, the question appears to be reasonably robust. A New Zealand-specific version of the question was asked, which allows closer exploration of student choice (and closer tracking of parental qualifications in the intermediary area of non-university post-secondary education).

Educational aspirations are traditionally thought to be structured by social class, although objectively determined ability may also be important. However, in this dataset the only measures are the educational qualifications of the parents, together with measures of household possessions.

Preliminary analysis of the educational aspiration data (Chamberlain & Walker 2001 Chapter 5) showed that:

…as was the case in 1994, “to finish university” was the most popular education aspirations [and that there was a] higher proportion of students aspiring to “finish secondary school” on 1998. (p. 85)

The international context is interesting.

The proportion of New Zealand year 9 students with aspirations to finish university (52%) was similar to the proportions reported by their counterparts in Australia (55%) and Singapore (57%) but lower than the proportions for Malaysia (65%), Canada (76%) and the US (78%). The proportion of New Zealand students who indicated that they did not know how far they intended to go in education (13%) was similar to the proportions in many other countries… (p. 86).

The following analysis focuses on those wishing to “finish university”, with a secondary focus of attention on those wishing to undertake “some vocational
education”, and a tertiary focus of attention on the “don’t knows” who have yet to be able to give a reasonably definitive response about their aspirations.

In terms of the educational ambitions:

- just over half wish to proceed through university – perhaps 20% seem content with secondary education and less than 10% are considering vocational education, while more than 10% are not yet sure;
- large proportions (c30%) don’t know their parental educational qualifications or are not living with that parent: some 20% of parents are reportedly university graduates, while about one-third attended only secondary school and a tiny handful only primary school;
- girls tend to be more ambitious (60% v. 45%); although boys twice as likely as girls (11% v. 6%) to engage in vocational education;
- immigrants are more ambitious than New Zealand-born (70% v. 50%), and similarly those speaking English “sometimes”;
- those with more books at home are more ambitious;
- both mother and father’s educational levels have a similar and quite powerful influence, with the father’s educational level apparently a little more powerful;
- Asian and other ethnicities have the highest educational ambitions (c80%) compared to Pākehā (54%), Pacific Islanders (47%) and Māori (40%). Asian and other ethnicities have a low interest in vocational education, but Māori and Pacific Islanders only a bit more. The high proportion of Māori and Pacific Islanders “don’t knows” is worrying.
- When differences within Māoridom are further explored, it shows that sole Māori are less ambitious than mixed Māori (37% v. 43%) and compared to the remainder.
- Multiplicity of ethnicities seems related to level of ambition: low 50–60% for those with one or two ethnicities and 60–70% for those with several. (Maybe this is an artefact of the methodology.)

The concern, then, becomes the extent to which the relationship between educational aspirations and their predictors varies by ethnic group: in particular, are highly educated Māori as successful in “injecting” higher educational aspirations into their offspring compared to Pākehā? It is clear that Māori parents are only half as likely to have achieved a university qualification compared to European. The data in the various ethnic-specific versions of Table 5 indicate this is exactly the case. Across several different educational levels of parents it is apparent that Māori (as opposed to Pākehā) are less likely to intend to achieve a university qualification. Māori parents are less able to pass on their achieved position.

Other work with this data is possible. One possibility is that there are “school effects” set by the general climate of those at a particular school, perhaps in turn reflecting the area in which the school is located. Use of the New Zealand specific measure of educational aspiration may provide useful fine-tuned information. Finally, the overall effect of both socio-economic status and ability needs to be assembled.

5.2.4.1 Conclusion
It has been shown Māori children are likely to attain higher educational qualifications than their parents. However, there is still a marginal difference compared to non-Māori in the ability of Māori parents to inspire higher educational achievements from their children.

5.2.5 Ethnic involvement in tertiary education

In a knowledge society, access to tertiary education can be crucial. The Ministry of Education provides downloadable Excel files of enrolments for the year 2001. These cover characteristics including:

- ethnicity
- gender
- level of qualification (broad and detail)
- institution where student studies
- field of study
- whether full-time or part-time
- previous situation of student.

Various combinations of these are also provided. One complication is that overseas students are also included in the figures, but these have been removed where possible. Some tables provide estimates of multiple enrolments. This section examines Māori/non-Māori differences in tertiary studies across this range of variables.

*Ethnic Profiles:* Nearly 30,000 Māori students constitute a little over 10% of the total enrolment. Māori tertiary students are especially concentrated at the “certificate” level, with a high proportion enrolled for diploma studies, and correspondingly lower proportions of degree and especially post-graduate studies (under half the national average for post-graduate). Far more Māori women are engaged in tertiary studies, although this is common to all groupings.

*Ethnic Shares:* Some 8% of post-graduate students are Māori, 11% of degree students, 18% of diploma students and 19% of certificate students: overall some 14% which is a reasonable proportion compared to the Māori component of New Zealand society. More specific information about particular types of qualification being studied for is available. There are high concentrations of Māori involved with higher degrees, institution-given diplomas, and institution-given certificates.

*Types of Establishment and Establishments:* Māori dominate wānanga, and are more likely to be found at polytechnics than universities. There are particularly high concentrations in those tertiary institutions located in Māori-dominated areas, especially where there are strong institutional ties with tangata whenua.

*Previous Situations:* Māori students are less likely to proceed straight from school and are more likely to move to tertiary education from being unemployed (or otherwise on a benefit).

*Fields of Study:* There are high Māori concentrations in education, art/music/handicrafts, the humanities, the social sciences, computing, service trades,
sport and recreation and in general foundation programmes. There are lower proportions in religion/theology, science, mathematics, engineering, and built environment.

General: The enrolment figures suggest that Māori are heavy users of the tertiary system, although slightly behind their population share. However, their involvement in the tertiary system tends to be in less “high power” areas.

5.2.6 Māori-medium school education

Ministry of Education figures provide some account of the extent to which Māori (and non-Māori) students are being educated in either bicultural or full Māori immersion education. Numbers taper off as years of schooling increase. There is an emphasis (especially in earlier years) on immersion teaching (although fewer non-Māori are involved in these classes).

5.3 Employment: income, occupation, work history, aspirations

No statistical sources of particular interest were recovered within this range of topics. Ethnic differences in terms of industry, occupations, employment status, education, income, hours of work and so on have been usefully described in other publications (e.g. Statistics New Zealand, 1998a).

5.4 Unpaid and voluntary work: unemployment patterns by ethnicity

Work and Income New Zealand data for July 2001 provide an up-to-date picture of the ethnic composition of unemployment in various areas of Northland and Auckland. Nearly 60,000 are enrolled as unemployed in the general Auckland region. Of these some 15% in Auckland North Shore are Māori, 20% in central Auckland and 30% in South Auckland (60% in Northland). The figures vary among the various offices in somewhat expected patterns.

5.5 Ethnic distribution in the provision of welfare services

A key concern for those studying ethnic disparities in New Zealand is the extent to which welfare services are provided to appropriate “targets” and in appropriate ways to the various ethnic categories. This report endeavours to obtain recent data (see Appendix Tables 4.5.1 to 4.5.5).

Given considerable change in the organizations providing such services, it is not always easy to track such data, although the 2001 Census information will allow updates when it is available. The (newly formed) Ministry of Social Development has taken responsibilities for organizing data from the welfare sector of the Government,
although the amount of ethnicity data is not large, being confined almost entirely to one (partial) table. The source for the Ministry of Social Development report is the SWIFTT database as at mid-year 2000. Moreover, as the report indicates:

The recording of ethnicity data has received increasing operational emphasis over recent years. Among people receiving income support, which may be paid over a long period of time… a large amount of ethnicity data is missing. (MSD 2001a: 27)

Two main tables are derived from the published data: the second “corrected” for “not available” information by distributing numbers according to the known portion. The broad pattern of the ethnic distribution of benefits is clearly affected by the socio-economic and age differences among ethnic groups. Thus Māori, in particular, benefit little from those benefits targeted towards the elderly but are disproportionately represented among those services supporting the less well off.

Another interesting feature of the information is there is evidence of some ethnic sensitivity in the provision of particular ethnically targeted programmes, although the numbers involved are small.

Māori are disproportionately represented among the ranks of those registering for employment assistance.

Building on the available data, an exercise was attempted to estimate the benefit to Māori of the various benefits they receive, in a synoptic model. (This analysis should be complemented by an analysis of the tax-paying burden of different ethnic groups.) The numbers of each ethnic group obtaining the various benefits were tabulated and then the shares (assuming equal access to the benefits) were calculated. The results suggest that the New Zealand welfare services system is broadly “ethnic-neutral” with Māori obtaining overall a “fair share”. They lose out on age-related benefits but obtain more of other benefits.

5.6 Health: ethnic differences in children’s injuries

A major indicator of the ability of groups to survive in their societal conditions concerns the accidents their children are subject to. Accidents are the result of a complex of factors including the quality of technology and supervision children are exposed to, and the settlement conditions under which they live. The accidents befalling children (and adults) are the active concern of several research agencies in New Zealand, including accident research units attached to each of the medical schools and the organization Safekids.

However, the topic of ethnic differences in accidents is less often broached. This is, in part, because of an ongoing difficulty with ethnic classifications in medical data. In general, ethnic classifications are considered to be of low quality as the recording situations seldom yield high quality information. In addition, ethnic coding in the medical system has changed over time, with data up to 1995 collected on a “race” basis, and after then on a more correct ethnic basis. Ethnic mortality data are not
supplied for 1995. These differences imply a need to examine years before, after and around the change with care. Despite these difficulties, an examination of ethnic differences in child accidents may be worthwhile (see Appendix Tables 4.6.2 to 4.6.4).

Children are defined here as those under age 15, either school age or pre-school. Of course, there may be differences in the accidents of those at different ages within this age range, and in this section the standard five-year age groups are separately examined, with separate attention to those under one year old.

The data examined here come from two sources: mortality data on those children dying and morbidity data on those admitted to a hospital as a result of an accident. Each is examined separately. The years of data span 1993–1998 (1993–1997 for the mortality data and 1994–1998 for the morbidity data). The data are obtained from the New Zealand Health Information Service from information supplied from coroners and hospitals, and extracted by Safekids.

It is likely some of the differences between ethnic groups are the result of correlated factors, especially “socio-economic circumstances” and possibly more broadly different settlement conditions. To pursue the multiple effect of these correlated factors a further extension of this study will examine ethnic differences at a census area unit level, calculating ethnic and age-specific accident rates and correlating area differences in these with other appropriate area indicators, notably the “New Zealand Deprivation Index” (Salmond et al. 1998).

There are some 100 child-accident deaths in New Zealand per year, with a small increase in 1997 over the preceding four years. Nearly two-thirds involve males, and 60% are concentrated among the under five year olds, with another 20% each for the next two age groupings. A third of the deaths are in the “Auckland” super-region, with the South Island suffering only one-sixth the national total. Māori suffer over one-third of the deaths, whereas “European/ Pākehā” account for not much more than one half. The two main groupings of accidental death are motor-vehicle traffic deaths and deaths involving submersion or suffocation – fire accounts for nearly 10%.

Within the vehicle category, main causes include other vehicle-to-vehicle collision, vehicle/pedestrian collision, and loss of control of a motor vehicle. The submersion/suffocation grouping is evenly divided between drownings and mechanical suffocations.

The Auckland super-region broadly echoes the national pattern, but shows an increase for both 1996 and 1997, and among older children. Oddly, the ethnic breakdown is much the same for Māori, apart from a larger proportion of Pacific deaths, and a smaller proportion of European/Pākehā.

Ethnic differences within the Auckland super-region are examined. The Māori proportion is recorded as wildly different across the four years reported, encompassing half of the 1997 figures. This variation is a clear warning to be careful in interpreting the data. But apart from a slightly more even gender ratio the Māori figures are much in line with the more general regional pattern. Note that Māori and Pacific children are more likely to be involved in motor vehicle accidents.
Over the five years of morbidity data there are some 15,000 hospital admissions annually, a total of 75,000 in the dataset. While there is a slight increase in 1998 over 1997, the 1998 figure is lower than that in 1994. Well over one-third occur in the Auckland super-region and nearly a quarter to Māori children. Only a few children under one year of age are hospitalised; the proportions of higher age groups declines slightly with age. There is a 60:40% split between male and female, and accidents are concentrated in the groupings of falls (44%), other accidents (28%) and associated with motor vehicles (15%). Length of stay in hospital is a reasonable indicator of the severity of the accident. Half are one-day (or, probably more technically, one-night) stays, with another 20% each falling in to the same-day and two to four-day categories. Only the tiniest handful (3%) stay over 10 days.

Restriction to examining only those from the Auckland super-region shows very much the same pattern as for the nation as a whole. One-day stays are a slightly smaller proportion.

The ethnic split within the Auckland super-region is quite uniform over time, suggesting the data are not subject to high over-time error in ethnic classifying. There seems to be a slight tendency for the Māori (and Pacific and Asian) proportions to have increased over time, although all suffered the highest rates for the period covered in 1994. Māori (and even more so Pacific) children seem more vulnerable in the one-to-four years age group. The male/female split is very slightly more pronounced. The Māori proportion involved with motor vehicle accidents is markedly higher (10% v. 5% of total accidents for each ethnic group respectively), while falls are proportionately lower (48% v. 42%). Māori children seem to be more severely affected, with a higher proportion among longer-stay patients.

Finally, the ethnic breakdown of child accidents in the Auckland super-region is examined. The proportion of Pākehā has dramatically fallen, with a steady increase in the proportion of Māori, Pacific and Asian (with slightly fewer “others”). The Māori share is highest for the under one year olds and thence decreases with increasing age. The accident types where the Māori proportion is higher include motor vehicle accidents, fire/flame injuries, and adverse effects of drugs. And the Māori proportion increases with level of severity.

5.6.1 Conclusion

There clearly are differences between Māori and non-Māori child accident rates, and there is a definite tendency for Māori accidents to have become worse over time. The categories of accident are significantly different in at least two accident groupings.

5.7 Drugs, alcohol and gambling use

5.7.1 Māori/non-Māori differences in alcohol and drug use and other attitudes and behaviours

Involvement with drugs can be part of a relaxed lifestyle, but too heavy involvement may be a signal of lack of ability to contribute in a modern society. This is
particularly an issue with a population which traditionally did not have alcohol and who, through the colonization process, were subject to massive predations because of alcohol. To these historical influences has been added the more recent link between some Māori youth and American black youth culture, which often includes the use of a wide range of drugs.

The Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit (APHRU) has engaged over the last decade and a half in a series of studies to monitor the levels of drug (including alcohol use): national surveys were undertaken of alcohol in 1995 and 2000 (Habgood 2001) and of drug use in 1990 and 1998 (Field & Casswell 1999). Alongside these have been specifically Māori surveys of alcohol use in 1995 (Dacey 1997) and of drug use in 1998 (Dacey & Barnes 2000).

The appendices to the drug surveys (Dacey & Barnes, 2000 and Field & Casswell 2000) provide detailed tables that allow detailed comparisons of the extent to which Māori women and men have used particular drugs over the preceding 12 months. This data has been reworked (see Appendix Table 4.7.2).

In addition, some other details of drinking behaviour and attitudes are important in further fleshing out Māori/non-Māori differences. After all, the gross comparisons give only some idea of overall consumption levels; the social significance of drinking and drug use is more apparent from examining attitudinal and behavioural differences. The tables presented are gleaned from comparing material from the two reports.

A short comparison of Māori and non-Māori drinking behaviour and attitudes is given in Dacey (1997: 39–40). The following tables confirm and extend the patterns reported in that discussion.

The key points are (cf. Dacey):

- fewer Māori drink;
- Māori median men’s consumption is higher, but median women’s consumption lower;
- Māori mean consumption is higher;
- the male/female splits are similar;
- quantities of alcohol drunk per occasion is higher;
- Māori drink out more often;
- Māori are more involved in increasing and in decreasing drinking;
- economic reasons for drinking are more often mentioned (and accessibility of alcohol);
- reporting of problems from drinking is higher;
- similar reported levels of drunk-driving;
- being victim of other’s drinking is higher.

For many drugs Māori use exceeds that of the general population, although often only slightly:

- alcohol drinking
- tobacco smoking
• marijuana
• hashish (only men)
• hashish oil
• skunk
• mushrooms
• kava (only women)
• solvents
• tranquillizers (only women).

There are some drugs Māori are less inclined to use; namely LSD, Ecstasy and opiates and kava (men). On other drugs usage is similar, including any hallucinogens.

The detailed differences show that to some considerable extent Māori and non-Māori drug users are involved in rather different lifestyles. But survey-based research can only point to the broadest of such differences.

5.7.2 Gambling

Another area where it is often thought that Māori may indulge more than non-Māori is in gambling. Indeed, statistics do show that Māori are slightly more likely to gamble, although only by a couple of percentage points. Māori are slightly less likely to participate in casino gambling (perhaps because this type of gambling is not available in many locations), but far more likely (twice as likely) to bet on gambling machines. Māori are more likely to bet where the betting is social; for example horse/dog races, bets with friends. However, they also participate more with gambling that has widespread outlets such as Instant Kiwi and Telebingo. It is likely that social class differences might reduce the disparities glimpsed in terms of gambling.

5.8 Conviction and sentencing patterns for Māori and non-Māori

It is a well-established social fact that the Māori (and also other Polynesian) population is over-represented among the “social justice” and other systems of the state. This section examines the details of Māori involvement with the courts in terms of prosecutions and sentencing.

The data used were obtained by Te Puni Kōkiri from the Department of Courts. It consists of prosecutions and (in another dataset) sentencing for the decade of the 1990s for the Auckland/Northland region. For each person (and also for corporate entities) information is available on:

• ethnicity
• gender
• age
• offence category
• conviction/sentencing category
• number of “counts”
• type of court
• court district.

The information on prosecuted offences and on convictions/sentencing covers only broad categories. Only a broad concept of ethnicity is available (i.e. European, Māori, Pacific Islanders, Asian, other). The range of social background characteristics provided is thin, with no socio-economic information included (see Appendix Table 4.7.3).

The Ministry of Justice has carried out considerable research into offending but also sentencing patterns, and this work forms the context for this section (e.g. 2000b, 2001a).

“Crime” results (broadly) from the interaction between (accused) criminals and the police administering the system of laws.

There are three general questions to be investigated in relation to these data:

• Are Māori more likely to be prosecuted (i.e. more likely to commit crime)?
• Are Māori accused of different sorts of crime?
• Are Māori more likely to receive heavier sentencing (once they are in the justice system)?

In examining these questions, the above perspectives are to be considered.

The first question is not reported here, but will be the subject of a further working paper. It will involve generating population profiles for each of the District Courts. Data on court populations are not routinely provided by Statistics New Zealand and must be developed from aggregating mesh-block data from Supermap3 (using 1996 Census data). The key aspects of each District Court profile will be ethnic proportions for each age-sex group. These will allow the calculation of age/gender/ethnic specific prosecution/conviction rates. This part of the study will then examine differences between District Courts in terms of these rates. It is expected that rates will vary in terms of broad characteristics of District Courts (e.g. rural v. urban) and also by the relative ethnic shares in each District Court. In addition, in order to examine socio-economic differences, ethnic/occupation profiles will be calculated, although only indirect (i.e. “ecological”) tests of this hypothesis can be attempted.

The second question tackled is to examine differences between ethnic groups (and also in terms of district, age and gender) of types of crime, types of conviction/sentencing and number of counts. (Corporate crime will not be included.) Three-way tables will be assembled to investigate the extent to which the Māori pattern might be affected by the age, gender, geographical distribution and other differences between Māori and non-Māori.

Particular attention is addressed to the different processes implicated in each broad category of crime:

• Violent crime is likely to reflect cultural values and social situation.
• Property crime is likely to be socio-economically linked: poorer people are more impelled to minor forms of burglary etc although the role of professional criminals is important especially with larger crimes.

• Public order crime may reflect policing policies and broader community views about behaviour (especially in public settings), and this category may reflect apparent active (even “racist”) policing practice.

The third question attempts to focus on processes within the court system. Do punishments “fit the crime”, or are they apparently biased in terms of the characteristics of the accused? In providing some tentative answers to this question, this report provides cross-tabulations of sentence by offence for the various background characteristics.

Traffic offences are included only for 1998 and 1999: thus these must be partly excluded for the main analyses.

The proportion of crimes tried at High Court level is small (around 3%). Violent and drug crimes are more likely to be tried at High Court level. Findings include:

• Over the decade there is a slight tendency for levels of trials to have increased. (However, to some extent the level of trials may well be constrained by the capacity of courts – and perhaps other parts of the legal apparatus – to process cases.)

• Male offenders constitute c80% of the cases. Males predominate in violent crime, crimes against the person, and crime against justice and good order.

• Crimes are broadly spread across each of the post-17 five-year age groups into which the data have been pre-coded: those over 40 commit only as many crimes as those in other age brackets. Twenty to 24 year olds are the prime crime-prone age bracket, although the age groups on either side differ little. The predominance of this age bracket is greatest for crimes against the person and good order.

The crime profiles relevant to age and gender can be examined. Violence and drugs cases clog the High Court, and also are more prevalent among offenders with high counts. The advent of traffic offences has the apparent effect of diminishing other categories. Very young offenders are more likely to be charged for violence or traffic offences (perhaps they are “excused” other types of crime). Females are more likely to be accused of property crimes.

Sentences handed down by the High Court are more likely to be custodial, and seldom fines although the community service option is relatively highly used. High Court trials less frequently result in conviction but then discharge without further penalty. High-count offenders are more likely to be incarcerated.

The pattern of penalties differs slightly over time: community based sentences have increased slightly and conviction/discharges increased. Females are slightly less likely to be imprisoned and more likely to receive community-based sentences.

Young offenders are more likely to be imprisoned, with older offenders slightly less likely to receive community based sentences, and slightly more likely to receive “other” sentences.
It is difficult to perceive distinct patterns in terms of the relationship between type of crime and sentencing. Violent crimes seem more heavily punished followed by property, drug and against justice types of crime. Disorderly conduct and miscellaneous types of crime receive the least severe sanctions.

When the fit between crime and punishment is examined for each ethnic group, a broad similarity is revealed.

Ethnic differences in offence patterns are minuscule. Māori are a shade more likely to commit property offences or offend against justice and the public order. Pacific Islanders were more likely to commit violent offences – and property and disorderly conduct offences, and less likely with drugs (a pattern somewhat echoed by Asian offenders). Other ethnicities are (oddly) heavily involved with traffic offences (perhaps associated with the timing of their inclusion in the dataset).

Europeans and “Other” ethnicities are slightly more likely to be tried in the High Court.

Districts vary in the proportion of Māori offenders: North Northland (Kaitaia and Kaikohe), together with Dargaville, have the highest Māori proportions followed by Pukekohe and West Auckland. Pacific Island offenders are concentrated in South Auckland and Auckland, as are Asian.

5.8.1 Conclusion

The well-known over-representation of Māori in the crime data is apparent, although the extent to which there is variation between districts in terms of the extent of Māori offending has yet to be tracked. However, once offences have been committed there seemed to be very few (if any) differences in the way in which these offenders were dealt with. However, the data used here have very broad categories and this may mean that more subtle effects remain undetected.

5.9 Communications and transport: a Māori digital divide?

In a knowledge/information economy/society no group can risk falling behind in the drive to use computers and to access the Internet. Experience and skills in using information and communication technology are better built up from childhood exposure (although this has to be empirically demonstrated). If there are signs of more limited Māori access to the Internet, then attention to this issue could be highly strategic.

Information from Ministry of Social Development standard of living surveys (Waldegrave and Pole 2001) has indicated that Māori more often live in households where there is a lower level of computer access and use. However, this profile
information does not provide details of the dynamics of Internet and computer use. For this, we can turn to the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) survey (see Appendix Table 4.7.4).

The IEA survey (Nightingale & Chamberlain 1991) has a large number of questions concerning computers:

- playing computers outside school hours;
- possessing a home computer;
- liking computers in maths and science classes (correlated c0.8);
- using Internet at school, elsewhere;
- using e-mail or web for maths or science projects (correlation 0.76);
- using computers in maths and science classes; and
- teacher using computers in maths or science classes.

An attempt was made by factor analysis to reduce the variation of these items. Six factors were extracted and rotated, forming fairly robust and readily interpretable groupings:

- using Internet or web for projects;
- using and teacher using computer in science and maths classes;
- home use of computer and Internet;
- like computer use in maths and science;
- playing computer games out of school hours.

In sum, the factor analysis merely linked up reasonably obvious groupings of items.

An overall sketch of availability and use (and the social distribution of availability and use) can be built up:

- Most (three-quarters) were in a home with a computer, although only just over one-third were connected at home to the Internet.
- Most students (nearly three-quarters) report a moderate level of home equipment.
- Somewhat over half the pupils used computers in class, and of these the large majority liked the experience.
- On the other hand, reported teacher in-class use of computers is quite small. Similarly use of e-mail for projects was a minority activity although use of web was higher.
- Access to the Internet at school or elsewhere is reportedly high (nearly two-thirds).
- Some 40% never play computer games, a third do but for less than an hour a day, with the remaining one-quarter or so spread over rather more intense gaming categories.

There are few gender differences in terms of access to computers or the Internet, but boys report considerably higher levels of teacher and school exposure to computers, higher proportions liking computer activities and a much higher out-of-school commitment to playing computer games.
The social class pattern (as indicated by education of father) yielded complex but generally class-linked results. Children of higher-educated parents have a rather higher access to computers and a higher involvement with, and liking of, them. However, this seems to be slightly offset by a higher use of computers by teachers and in school. Involvement in computer games seems curvilinear, with the highest proportionate use coming in the middle education categories.

There are some sharp differences in ethnic terms. Whereas only just over half Māori students (Pacific Island students are even worse off) have computers at home, the other ethnic groups report almost universal coverage. This adverse home situation is slightly compensated for a school with higher “minority” exposure and certainly a high degree of Polynesian enthusiasm for being involved with computers. Internet usage by Māori pupils at home is low, but is largely compensated for by access to the Internet via other sources. Perhaps strangely, there is a particularly high involvement by Māori and Pacific Island students in computer games. Comparing sole and mixed Māori students identifies the former as having more exaggerated differences from Pākehā than the latter.

The next question is to endeavour to assess the extent to which Māori students are disadvantaged in terms of computer access and use by their socio-economic status. Examining socio-economic effects for each ethnic group separately shows that Māori fathers of similar educational status are considerably less likely to provide computer resources for their children.

5.9.1 Conclusion

Māori students do not get a head start from home support in terms of computers, and their access to the Internet is even lower. The difference is only partly attributable to socio-economic differences between Māori and non-Māori. On the other hand, the schools they attend seem to compensate very slightly for this deficit. Moreover, Māori (and Pacific Island) students make up for any deficits with particular bursts of enthusiasm, including considerable playing of computer games.

5.10 Māori organizations in Auckland

A brief attempt is made in this section to review the extent of Māori organizations and providers in Auckland confined to a count from an available directory (Tuhi Tuhi Communications 2000). A search of the Auckland City Library database of organizations revealed only 14 that included Māori in their “demographic type”. Takao rua-mana has a far better coverage, with its information updated annually (where possible), but totally reliant on self-reported information. It is somewhat marred for present purposes by:

- repeat listings under different headings (which I have partially been able to eliminate),
• listing of organizations which provide services to Māori and other clients but which are not particularly Māori-orientated, and even
• listings of organizations outside Auckland/Tamaki Makaurau.

Some organizations have Māori-related units and it seems useful to include these, although such units may or may not be the sole indicator of whether any organization is Māori “user-friendly”. The motivation to be included of not particularly Māori-orientated organizations (either service or commercial) is understandable as they clearly see the directory as a source of advertising and Māori clients as important to them. But they do create difficulties. It must be remembered, further, that many Māori organizations operate on the informal fringes and so would not be listed here. Further detailed work on Māori organizations in Auckland seems warranted.

Major categories include (numbers alongside):

• Marae c30
• Kōhanga reo c70
• Primary/secondary/tertiary education c45
• Other education c25
• Training c35
• Cultural groups c35
• Health c50
• Social services c70
• Religious 15–20
• Commerce c35.

But it is not merely the availability of Māori organizations that may be crucial; it is also their spatial accessibility which can be particularly significant (this is addressed in Prof. Forer’s contribution to this study).

Not all Māori organizations are entirely welcomed by all portions of the community. In the Organised Crime Project of the NZ Police (McCardle 1999) some 660 organised groups and gangs were identified through questioning District intelligence sources. Ties holding groups together include (in order) crime, locality, involvement with drugs, blood ties, ethnicity and prison ties.

5.10.1 Organizational memberships

It is also interesting to look at membership in Māori organizations (e.g. Māori-specific religious organizations). Jack Vowles (reported in MSD 2001b) collected information on specifically Māori organizational involvements (see Appendix Table 3.5.14). Nearly one in four Māori said they belonged to Māori organizations and almost all had attended at least one meeting during the previous year.
6. Policy and research implications

This final section assembles some evidence-based arguments concerning the provision of state services to Māori from the material in this study and other studies reviewed within it. State services are broadly (it is usually argued) made available to overcome disadvantages, which occur to particular groups or individuals in the “marketplace”: especially in terms of the labour market. The discussion addresses:

- theory providing rationales of assistance to Māori (as groups or as individuals belonging to this category); and
- a framework of choices in the delivery of assistance to Māori (as groups or to individuals belonging to this category).

This argument is framed within a broadly “public choice” framework, not a “Māori perspective” framework, although it is not necessarily incompatible with a Māori perspective.

6.1 Theory of assistance

There are several grounds on which assistance to Māori might be argued (cf. Chapple 2000a), namely, because it is:

- an essential good for Māori themselves;
- good for other New Zealanders that Māori be supported to prevent avoidable costs spilling into the Pākehā sector of society; and
- because of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Treaty arguments are well covered elsewhere. The argument here has deliberately not been framed in Māori terms. Certainly, the Treaty of Waitangi (but also the general presumptions of the New Zealand state) accords Māori the same rights as any other New Zealand citizen. In addition, it has been recognized that Māori deserve compensation for past wrongs (especially in relation to land acquisitions) that have been/are being addressed through the Waitangi Tribunal framework. Such issues are usually considered better kept apart from more contemporary claims.

Discussion could be extended beyond land claims to cover compensation for other past inequities (including overt discrimination and/or systematic exploitation) which have occurred historically and been built into the current situation. (Some have couched this as Māori having been the victims of a collective “post-traumatic stress syndrome”.) In the Māori case, the whole history of urbanization and its concomitant costs might be usefully examined – historically New Zealand capitalism has used this valuable workforce when it wanted but then it somewhat spat them out when labour market and economic conditions turned more difficult. For example, Māori might be compensated for the extent to which Māori likely life spans were reduced as a result of settlement/invasion. Such arguments might include the idea that structural changes are required to allow Māori potentials to break through. Again, this could be at least
partly subjected to empirical test, although it might be very difficult to pin down reasonable estimates of costs.

It can be suggested that Māori taonga (e.g. culture) deserve particular protection and support – at least to the level per capita (or fair share) that other areas of culture receive. It is also arguable that Māori individuals and whānau deserve to be brought up to the level playing field of other New Zealanders. Very broadly, there is a widespread presumption among Pākehā that although socio-economic inequalities of many Māori are to be recognized, that Māori receive at least their fair share of the state services (see above). But it is an empirical question about the extent to which Māori receive their due according to the grounds adduced (see above).

Beyond particular support for Māori culture and compensation for the unfair burdens of the past, it could be argued that Māori should deserve no further direct support. Rather, what is more important is the form of delivery. Services should be delivered to Māori in such a way that their effectiveness for Māori is enhanced. Alternatively, the mix of services might be shaped to be particularly appropriate to Māori. For example, Māori might prefer the economic empowerment of iwi developments rather than the dependency of high state welfare provision. And/or Māori may prefer services delivered to them in Māori by Māori, and so on.

A final line of argument is that whatever the Māori needs, it should be Māori wants that are provided for: or, that there should be Māori self-determination, choice and self-empowerment in the type and mechanisms of delivery.

These points can be summarized as follows (Table 2.12):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.12 Possible bases for state assistance to Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of State Support:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• compensation for land acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• compensation for other more diffuse hurts and damages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• extra support for capacity-building/to level “playing fields”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• support for (collective) culture maintenance/extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Delivery of State Support:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriateness/effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Māori-controlled/Māori-sensitive/ “standard”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Evidence-based policy: making the linkages from research to policy

Consideration of policy aims are intensely political/normative concerns. How can a research project, such as the present study, assist with these different lines of argument? There are several ways in which our evidence (and argumentation around it) might address the political questions. These include:
• providing evidence about the values which underpin both Table 2.12 Possible Bases for State Assistance to Māori (as Table 2.12 Possible Bases for State Assistance to Māori retain for the most part the power over such decisions) and Māori thinking on these issues;
• providing evidence on Māori preferences;
• providing evidence of outcomes and processes in achieving outcomes; and, more generally,
• indicating whether the social conditions exist for pursuing particular paths of provision.

6.3 A policy framework

Policy options must cluster around four key questions:

• What units are “targeted” (individuals, households…)?
• What characteristics of these units should attract assistance (“targeting criteria”)?
• What units should provide assistance (Te Puni Kōkiri, mainstream government departments, non-governmental organizations, Māori non-governmental organizations…)?
• Through what means should assistance be provided (money, services, indirect)?

Before examining these issues, attention should be drawn to past experience. In his review of Māori population history Pool (see e.g. 1991 passim) has particularly drawn attention to the successful, although paternalistic, policy interventions of the 1945–1980 period, which clearly improved Māori living conditions while not tackling many emergent ones:

• These policies delivered by the Department of Māori Affairs and were definitely targeted to Māori. Yet the policies were also universal.
• Health policy (important for its longer term effect on Māori quality of life) and other sectoral policies were important but these were nested within a more general social policy.
• The policy actively encouraged and assisted the rural exodus, and thus access to urban employment opportunities.

However, this refers to a past era in which the place of Māori in New Zealand society and their settlement patterns were different than today. So the lessons should be retrieved, but may not be readily re-applied.

6.3.1 Unit for targeting

Evidence has been amassed from this and other studies that some consideration should be given to the whānau organization of Māori social life. (In this context whānau is defined as “extended family”: most usually a set of siblings with their children and parents.) However, it seems that whānau activities, while central to many Māori, are somewhat removed (even if only analytically) from family activities; they form a somewhat over-layered level of activity.
On the other hand, perhaps, given the somewhat more fluid Māori linkages at least in residential terms, funding should “follow the child” (“or follow the dependant” at least) which would be a “bottom-up” way of handling this issue.

The very considerable spatial spread of most Māori is a major limitation to the design of separate Māori services. There are few areas where there is a sufficient concentration for separate delivery to be particularly efficient. On the other hand, spatial advantage should be taken of those areas where there is a high density of Māori settlement. Capacity-building support is needed to endeavour to ensure that Māori organizations and services are of sufficiently high quality. However, even in areas of high concentration some degree of choice in Māori v. non-Māori provision should be retained, on the general grounds of freedom of choice and to ensure that some degree of competition sharpens an organization’s activities.

Many Māori are involved in levels of collective Māori activity, as well in areas of collective Pākehā activity. Some Pākehā are also involved. It may be useful to separate, somewhat, the support given to whānau and other collective activities from support given to operative families. How? It may be useful to ensure that family financing is not unduly undermined by the financial burden of whānau operations. “Family trusts” (which can insulate from immediate shock, and spread financial and other burdens over time) may be a useful legal mechanism for such a partial separation and they should be encouraged in themselves. Whānau should not only be invoked (as in “family conferences”) when there is a dysfunctionality to sort out. How can they be encouraged?

Although many Māori families operate in a somewhat different framework than most Pākehā families, nevertheless they remain the main operational unit of Māori social life. There is much evidence that too many Māori families are dysfunctional to some degree. They are insufficiently supportive of their own members, and there is insufficient investment in the human capital of the whānau. Ways of supporting Māori families need to be sought. In particular, ways of providing incentives to whānau/families to motivate their own behaviour might be useful. This could take the form – at a more micro-level – of the iwi development model. Instead of resources being ploughed into continuing dependency, rewards might be given for reaching of objectives. Perhaps a whānau voucher system could be explored. Also, if financial assistance were available to whānau their constituent families might be able to be provided with advice and support (e.g. family counselling, budgeting, home provision through growing vegetables and so on).

The whānau mechanism suggested here may well be sufficiently robust to be able to operate over a wide range of contexts (especially in terms of different type of Māori community). In addition, some consideration needs to be given to the way in which Māori fit into the framework of their residential community, and sensitivity to different community contexts might be useful.

6.3.2 Characteristics to target

The overriding question is the extent to which Māori disparities are shaped more by general socio-economic conditions than anything specifically Māori. The general
lesson to be learned from the studies summarized above is that it appears that much of the disparity between Māori and non-Māori can be “statistically explained” in socio-economic terms, but that nevertheless there is usually an “unexplained” residue. Certainly there are few grounds for targeting all Māori in terms of broadly socio-economic disparities.

As with non-Māori, there may need to be an array of adequacies that need attention. It is important for Māori that this list is sufficiently extensive and is not artificially restricted. There is some tendency to try to change or target Māoriness (in cultural terms rather than racial). In this sense, the main objective of policy is to increase the Māori cultural skills and identification of individuals. However, it is not always clear that investment in further involvement in Māori culture always has a good pay-off in other areas of life, although in general there seems to be some evidence that it tends to increase confidence, and life-satisfaction. There is some evidence that increasing Māori social opportunities, rather than necessarily cultural opportunities, is important. Obviously the two can hardly be entirely separate but the degree of linkage can vary.

Two further issues arise with a possible overemphasis on Māori culture. One is that the availability of such cultural services should probably be also provided to those Pākehā interested in availing themselves – probably not a huge demand and thus easily met (although possibly there could be local blow-outs). It is in the interest of Māori to meet this demand as it should increase the support level for Māori activities among Pākehā and also it ensures that racial exclusion is not too prominent. Given the large proportion of people with part-Māori descent there is also the possibility of over-burdening financial resources targeted to Māori if the criteria are too broad.

The second issue concerns the discomfort (not always temporary) that non-Māori speaking Māori face in Māori situations. Possession of Māori cultural skills can be a weapon with which to morally embarrass other Māori, and language skills may not be necessarily accompanied by appropriate cultural understandings and sensitivities. So Māori-identifiers may need to be tolerant of Māori non-identifiers.

Another line of approach is to mainly target non-ethnic social disadvantages. These may be more readily changeable, with less stigma attached to those targeted. But in this approach, specific Māori aspects become quite residualised and sidelined.

Finally, what criteria are to be used to define Māori when it comes to providing goods and services? Self-declaration might lead to non-Māori taking advantage. Should degrees of Māoriness be recognized? There seems little evidence that anyone wants to discriminate in terms of the general category: the categories Māori/non-Māori are a binary and once someone’s Māoriness is accepted it is then another matter how much involvement they choose to pursue. In the end, it seems clear that the only point on which a stand can be made is that someone must be interested in identifying as Māori and be able to show some (any) extent of Māori ancestry.

What mechanism can be used to “prove” Māori ancestry? One possibility is through iwi registries. Certainly, there might be some concern were identity cards to be issued.
6.3.3 Assistance units

Māori should be able to retain access to a variety of Māori and non-Māori delivery and support organizations. There are some areas where Māori organizations/services seem particularly relevant, for example, health. In other areas, a “bicultural” approach seems more justified, for example, sport.

6.3.4 Means of delivery

The Ministry of Education advice seems to hold here: any services to Māori (and non-Māori) should involve sensitivity and clear interest, with particular “user-friendly” faces and procedures being available.

Another approach to means of delivery would be to explore what the desired outcome should be, and what level of provision might be involved.

6.4 Equity in life-chances: the desired outcome?

It is important to ask what one is trying to achieve in terms of policy. It is essential to be very clear about what the key policy objective is.

The concern can be presented in a variety of quite colloquial ways: what do Māori (as opposed to non-Māori) want to get as a good deal in New Zealand? What might be done to overcome any disparities that are “socially unjust”? How can Māori “life-chances” be improved, especially objective life-chances, such as life expectancy? And how can the subjective quality of life of Māori be improved?

There are two main general models of quality of life that are pertinent: we can contrast models which posit equality of outcome from those suggesting we should aim at equality of process. The former is a tougher stance demanding that everyone (irrespective of personal qualities or talents) should achieve the same level of success. The latter holds rather that existing conditions should not get worse, or even that poorer initial conditions should be compensated for. This places the emphasis on the fairness of the process. However, the trade-off for this more limiting stance is that it tends to underemphasize the (possible) need for structural reform in order to “level the playing field”.

A major issue is whether the same goals should be assumed for each grouping within a society. Are Māori goals similar to those of non-Māori? It can be reasonably assumed that Māori and non-Māori have similar levels of aspiration, at least in terms of economic/material matters, and policy should (at least as a bottom line) be built on this.

A final point is the extent to which these policy models are Māori-specific. My general position is that although the policy models particularly target a Māori situation, in fact it would be possible to substitute the name of any other “minority group” and achieve the same sort of result, although of course the details of tackling the needs of other ethnic groups would need to be different.
6.5 More specific policy models

Targeting is a major issue. Māori are, apart from some pockets, too broadly distributed for Māori-only delivery to work very well. There are also major issues of exact mechanisms for identifying who is Māori in order for delivery to be correctly accessed.

This study concludes with a review of the various policy models, this time from the point of view of how the assembled evidence supports each. Note that as before the ordering of the models is somewhat arbitrary.

The Age Difference model: The age structure (and other differences between Māori and non-Māori) place extra impediments on Māori levels of achievement.

- **Policy Implication:** such differences are obdurate in the short term, and it is only in the very long term they might fade away. Considerable impact from the presently featured age differences at present are likely to hold over the next half-century. Moreover, there is considerable cohort peristalsis in the system, so that particular generations may need particular attention (in particular, that marred by unemployment shock). One policy implication might be to implement population policy (e.g. encourage limiting births) to try to even out demographic differences, but this seems unnecessary and undoubtedly attended by many implementation difficulties. In any case, Māori fertility overall is not that much more than for non-Māori and so there is not imminent swamping of the total population by Māori through a demographic explosion. Given some non-Māori concern about this, this point might be usefully advertised. Attention might particularly be given those age groupings where there are higher proportions of Māori, but policy-makers also need to be aware that this must not imply the ignoring of traditionally under-populated age groups such as the elderly: rather such groupings need careful support.

The Class model: much of the lack of achievement of many Māori is also shared by the New Zealand working class more generally.

- **Policy Implication:** long-term strategies are necessary to build up the ability of Māori to engage successfully in the Pākehā class system. This point is key in any development of policy options, as the Māori middle class remains relatively small. (On the other hand, there is not sharp occupational differentiation.) Working class Māori should receive attention accorded to other working class people.

The "Recent Migrant" model: Māori have only been in cities a couple of generations, but will catch up with the mainstream in time. (Of course, Māori are in general tangata whenua so that applying the concept of migrants has to be carefully handled. Also many younger generation Māori are second or third generation migrants.)

- **Policy Implication:** long-term strategies may be required to overcome deficits not overcome as the migrants confront the host society. Māori are still more mobile residually and occupationally and this limits their human investment and long-term strategies.
**The Capitalist/Structural model:** Māori have insufficient access to the main structural levers of collective achievement (e.g. economic capital) and more generally the intergenerational mobility processes of Māori don’t work as well.

- **Policy Implication:** that Māori need more access to capital to participate in the central processes of capitalism. The iwi development model hasn’t “trickled down” to most Māori. Assistance with taking up both housing and new economic opportunities is needed.

**The Discrimination model:** Māori are seriously discriminated against by non-Māori who retain control over gatekeeping (access to societal resources).

- **Policy Implication:** education of gatekeepers and also ensuring that gatekeepers are sufficiently sensitive to issues of racism. While there is some high-intensity Pākehā support, and a broad diffuse level of support, any explicit Māori advantages attract negative attention and this should be avoided. Encouragements should be offered to “gatekeepers” across the full range to encourage Māori.

**The “Culture of Poverty” model:** many Māori (and others) have taken up (more or less actively) a culture that is resistant to capitalism.

- **Policy Implication:** either those holding counter-cultural values need to be supported in achieving through non-capitalist routes, or they need “re-education”. Cultural enrichment programmes might be offered to encourage other ideological contexts for thinking, and efforts made to turn Māori-orientated gangs to more productive pursuits.

**The “Cultural Deficit” model:** Māori culture has values that inhibit achievement.

- **Policy Implication:** as for “culture of poverty” model. Some reward systems need to be created.

**The “Pākehā Capital” argument:** organizations in New Zealand have such a Pākehā flavour that they do not work as well for Māori.

- **Policy Implication:** Setting up either Māori “providers” or organizations with more distinctly “Māori” user-friendliness. Many Pākehā-imbued organizations are becoming more Māori-friendly but this could be further encouraged (e.g. Māori audit procedure to obtain a “cultural safety” rating). And/or Māori might be educated/supported to overcome some of their difficulties: some job (re)training schemes come close to this.

**The “Contextual” model:** Māori in some geographical (or community) situations face extra impediments than those in other geographical (or community) situations.

- **Policy Implication:** targeted assistance to particular localities or groups. A major concern is that Māori service delivery be adjusted to geographical contexts. In
turn this might meant that Māori delivery agencies should be carefully planned and use good market research.

_The “Social Deficit” model:_ involvement in Māori social organizations/activities drains energy and resources better devoted to achievement.

- **Policy Implication:** Māori observances of their culture might be encouraged or discouraged. Programmes offered to Māori might need to separate more clearly where support and social activities are offered as opposed to (or as well as) more strictly cultural achievements.

_The “Social Empowerment” model:_ involvement in Māori organizations/activities generates fresh energy and resources for achievement.

- **Policy Implication:** Encouragement of involvement in Māori observances. To “people” Māori organizations and services needs much energy and skill, and there may not be sufficient reservoirs of person-power and skills available for this.

### 6.6 Research implications

To a considerable extent, systematic research on the topics addressed in this report has been lacking. There is a large store of low-quality (error-ridden) data which have been partly worked over in other studies, and which are sampled in this. Better quality data together with the more sophisticated approaches to data analysis that are needed to elicit the processes at work is rare, and only some exercises are provided here. As a result, there is a wide range of work that remains to be tackled in order to provide the evidence-base on which good quality policy might be built.

In the course of conducting this study the need for several further studies has been noted. These have included:

- A need to update information, especially with the 2001 Census results becoming available, together with a continuing stream of relevant surveys (see above);
- A standard requirement is for ethnic effects to always be checked out to pin down the extent to which observed differences seem rather to flow from other social background factors associated with these differences. Only a limited amount of such testing has been carried out.
- Further work needs to be carried out on census and survey data held by Statistics New Zealand.
- A methodological spin-off is the need to establish the validity of the Māori sampling of a range of surveys covering Māori: e.g. both the New Zealand Election Study and International Social Science Programme studies.
- Further study to use the iwi data to replicate the comparative study of selected iwi conducted by Gould (1996): the preliminary work for this is reported in Benton (2002). (Two further analyses are to be carried out on this data. One is to take those iwi that can generally be regarded as “tangata whenua” of the extended region and to compare these against other iwi whose spatial bases
(rohe) are clearly outside Auckland. A second analysis will compare those not affiliated with any iwi with the iwi-affiliated Māori).

In addition, there is clearly a need for long-term monitoring of the changing social and economic conditions of Māori individuals and whānau, together with a long-term systematic, longitudinal and multi-level framework of studies, which would aggregate knowledge about Māori and the trajectories of their progress. Cluny Macpherson (2001) has already outlined some of the desiderata of the latter component of the necessary future studies.
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